DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 355 HE 020 228

TITLE	Annual Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1986. U.S. Department of Education.
INSTITUTION	Department of Education, Washington, DC. Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	86
NOTE	351p.; Appendix is marginally legible.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation, Planning and Evaluation Service, Room 3127, FOB-6, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202 (limited supply).
PUB TYPE	Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC15 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Bilingual Education; Contracts; Educational Research; *Elementary Secondary Education; Eligibility; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Libraries; *Postsecondary Education; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Special Education; Student Financial Aid; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Department of Education

ABSTRACT

A guide to 99 programs administered by the U.S. Department of Education, covering activities as of September 30, 1986, is presented in this 16th annual report to Congress. Program profiles identify the enabling legislation, funding since 1981, the purpose of the program, and for some programs eligibility, strategies, and subprograms. Also specified for each program are: program objectives for fiscal year (FY) 1985, progress and accomplishments, costs and benefits, program effectiveness, highlights of activities, and a list of supporting studies and analyses. Any studies of the program that are planned or in progress are also listed, along with information contacts. The report covers: 21 programs under the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (e.g., Education of Disadvantaged Children); 5 programs under the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (e.g., Transition Program for Refugee Children); 27 programs under the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (e.g., Handicapped State Grant Program); 7 programs under the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (e.g., Basic Grants to States); 24 programs under the Office of Postsecondary Education (e.g., Pell Grants); and 13 programs under the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (e.g., Territorial Teacher Training Assistance Program). For evaluation contracts active during FY 1986, information is appended on: the funding amount, brief description of the contract, the contractor's name and contract number, start and end dates, and project officer's name. An index to the 99 programs is also included. (LB)

ED278355

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

FISCAL YEAR 1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation

HE 020 228

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOREWORD

This is the 16th annual report to the Congress on federally funded education programs and the seventh such report submitted by the Department of Education. The Annual Evaluation Report responds to the Congressional mandate in Section 417(a) and (b) of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended. This year, there is information on 99 programs administered by the Department during fiscal year 1986. The information in this report covers program activities as of September 30, 1986.

I welcome your suggestions on making the Annual Evaluation Report more useful in your work. Please direct your comments to Edward Glassman in the Planning and Evaluation Service, at (202) 245-8281, or at the address below.

Bruce M. Carnes
Deputy Under Secretary for
Planning, Budget and Evaluation

For copies while our limited supply lasts, contact:

Edward B. Glassman, Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation
Planning and Evaluation Service
Room 3127, FOB6
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Again in fiscal year 1986, the Planning and Evaluation Service (PES) in the Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, continued the effort to improve the technical and editorial quality of the Annual Evaluation Report. As Division Directors, Valena Plisko, Ricky Takai, and Jay Noell, reviewed all chapters on appropriate programs. Edward Glassman was again responsible for managing report preparation, with support from Sandra Richardson and Yolanda Marshall. All analysts and all secretaries in PES contributed through writing, revising, and typing report chapters. Each program office helped with comments on draft chapters about its own programs. As in past years, the Budget Service in the Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, the Office of the Under Secretary, and the Office of General Counsel, made valuable corrections in draft materials for the entire report. The Public Affairs Service in the Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, prepared the Index to the report.

Alan L. Ginsburg
Director, Planning and
Evaluation Service

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword.. i
Acknowledgments... ii

1. Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Chapter Number*

Education of Disadvantaged Children (Chapter 1, ECIA) Formula Grants to Local Education Agencies...................... 101
Migrant Education Program (Chapter 1, ECIA) Formula Grants to State Education Agencies.........................102
Formula Grants to States for Neglected or Delinquent Children..... 103
Education Block Grant (Chapter 2, ECIA) Consolidation of Elementary and Secondary Education Programs......104
General Assistance to the Virgin Islands.......................... 105
Civil Rights Technical Assistance and Training.................... 106
Follow Through--Grants to Local Education Agencies and Other Nonprofit Agencies... 107
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (Impact Aid): Maintenance and Operations....................................... 108
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (Impact Aid): Construction.. 109
Allen J. Ellender Fellowships..................................... 110
Indian Education--Financial Assistance to Local Education Agencies and Indian-Controlled Schools--Part A............................ 111
Special Programs for Indian Students--Part B...................... 112
Special Programs for Indian Adults--Part C........................ 113
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program.......................... 114
Women's Educational Equity.. 115
Migrant Education--High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP)......................... 116
Arts in Education Program... 117
Inexpensive Book Distribution Program............................. 118
Law-Related Education... 119
Mathematics and Science State Grants Program...................... 120
Magnet Schools Assistance Program................................. 121

2. Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs

Bilingual Education Programs--Discretionary Grants to Local Education Agencies--Part A.. 201
Bilingual Education Programs--Data Collection, Evaluation, and Research--Part B... 202
Bilingual Education Programs--Training and Technical Assistance--Part C.. 203
Transition Program for Refugee Children........................... 204
Emergency Immigrant Education Program............................. 205

---

* Chapter numbers, followed by page numbers within chapters, appear in the upper-right corner of each page.

3. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Chapter Number*

Aid to States for Education of Handicapped Children in State-Operated and State-Supported Schools 301
Handicapped State Grant Program 302
State Incentive Grants for Preschool Services to Handicapped Children 303
Handicapped Regional Resource Centers 304
Handicapped Innovative Programs--Services to Deaf-Blind Children and Youth 305
Early Childhood Education Program for Handicapped Children 306
Innovative Programs for Severely Handicapped Children 307
Postsecondary Education Programs for Handicapped Persons 308
Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped 309
Handicapped Teacher Recruitment and Information Program 310
Discretionary Grants for Handicapped--Innovation and Development Program 311
Discretionary Grants for Handicapped--Media Services and Captioned Films 312
Education of the Handicapped Act--Special Studies 313
Secondary Education and Transitional Services for Handicapped Youths 314
Removal of Architectural Barriers to the Handicapped 315
National Institute of Handicapped Research 324
Rehabilitation Services--Basic Support 325
Client Assistance Program (CAP) 326
Discretionary Project Grants for Training Rehabilitation Personnel 327
Grants for Vocational Rehabilitation of Severely Handicapped Individuals 328
Special Projects for Initiating Recreation Programs for Handicapped Individuals 329
Rehabilitation Services--Special Projects for Handicapped Migratory and Seasonal Farm Workers 330
Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults 331
Rehabilitation Services--Projects with Industry 332
Centers for Independent Living 333
Vocational Rehabilitation Service Projects for Handicapped American Indians 334
Independent Living Services for Older Blind Individuals 335

4. Office of Vocational and Adult Education

Vocational Education--Basic Grants to States 401
Vocational Education--Consumer and Homemaking Education 402
Vocational Education--Community-Based Organizations Programs 403
Vocational Education--Research and Occupational Information 404
Vocational Education--Indian and Hawaiian Native Programs 405
Bilingual Vocational Education Programs--Discretionary Grants 406
Adult Education--Grants to States 407

---

* Chapter numbers, followed by page numbers within chapters, appear in the upper-right corner of each page.

5. Office of Postsecondary Education

Chapter Numbers*

Pell (Basic Educational Opportunity) Grant Program.......... 501
Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program.......... 502
State Student Incentive Grants.............................. 503
Guaranteed Student Loan Program............................. 504
Direct Loan Program... 505
Work-Study Program.. 506
Upward Bound.. 507
Talent Search... 508
Educational Opportunity Centers............................. 509
Special Services for Disadvantaged Students................. 510
Veterans' Cost-of-Instruction Program....................... 511
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education......... 512
Training Program for Special Programs Staff and Leadership Personnel.............................513
Institutional Aid Programs.................................. 514
Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program........... 515
Law School Clinical Experience Program...................... 516
Legal Training for the Disadvantaged........................ 517
Fellowships for Graduate and Professional Study............. 518
Fulbright-Hays Training Grants Program...................... 519
Foreign Language Training and Area Studies.................. 520
Cooperative Education....................................... 521
College Housing Program..................................... 522
Annual Interest Subsidy Grants.............................. 523
Loans for Construction, Reconstruction, and Renovation of Academic Facilities.................................... 524
National Graduate Fellowship Program........................ 525
Carl D. Perkins Scholarship Program......................... 526

6. Office of Educational Research and Improvement

Territorial Teacher Training Assistance Program............. 601
Public Library Services--Grants to State Library Agencies... 602
Interlibrary Cooperation--Grants to State Library Agencies.. 603
Library Literacy Program--Discretionary Grants.............. 604
Library Career Training--Discretionary Grants and Contracts. 605
Library Research and Demonstrations--Discretionary Grants and Contracts.. 606
Strengthening Research Library Resources--Discretionary Grants to Major Research Libraries....................... 607
Public Library Construction--Grants to State Library Agencies.. 608
Library Services for Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives..... 609
Office of Research.. 610
Secretary's Discretionary Program--Discretionary Activities to Improve Elementary and Secondary Education............. 611
Secretary's Discretionary Fund for Programs of National Significance... 612
Excellence in Education Program............................. 613

---

* Chapter numbers, followed by page numbers within chapters, appear in the upper-right corner of each page.

Appendix--Evaluation Contracts Active in OPBE During Fiscal Year 1986 .... A-1

Index to the Annual Evaluation Report I-1

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN (CHAPTER 1, ECIA) FORMULA GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES (CFDA No. 84.010)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), Chapter 1, P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 3801-3808, 3871-3876) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Total Authorization	Total Appropriation	Appropriations for LEA Grants 1/
1982	$3,480,000,000	$3,033,969,000	$2,562,753,163
1983	3,480,000,000	3,200,394,000	2,727,587,568
1984	3,480,000,000	3,480,000,000	3,003,680,000
1985	Indefinite	3,688,163,000	3,200,000,000
1986	Indefinite	3,529,572,000 2/	3,062,400,000

Purpose: To provide financial assistance to local education agencies (LEAs) to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

Eligibility: LEAs receive grants under Chapter 1. The size of a grant is based primarily on the number of children in low-income families within the district. Chapter 1 also makes payments to State education agencies (SEAs) for administration.

The Department is responsible for calculating State and county allocations, using a formula that takes into account, among other factors, the number of 5- to 17-year-old children in low-income families and the average State per-pupil expenditure. SEAs are then responsible for making subcounty allocations to their LEAs. LEAs identify eligible school attendance areas with the highest concentrations of children from low-income families and provide services to low-achieving children from public and nonpublic schools who live in the eligible attendance areas.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

In academic year 1985-86, the fourth year in which school districts provided compensatory educational services under Chapter 1, the Department's principal goals and objectives for this program were as follows:

Program Management

- To enable SEAs and LEAs to implement programs and projects designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children,
- To design and continuously refine procedures for onsite monitoring of the SEAs' administration of Chapter 1, and
- To continue to provide assistance to SEAs and LEAs in providing equitable services to children who attend religiously affiliated schools in light of the Aguilar v. Felton decision.

Program Improvement

- To identify and disseminate information to improve the quality of Chapter 1 projects and practices, and
- To promote the involvement of parents in the education of their children.

Program Evaluation

- To maintain the quality and quantity of Chapter 1 evaluation data collected by LEAs and SEAs and to increase the use of these data to improve programs, and
- To develop and maintain a computer-based management system to collect, store, and retrieve a wide range of information and data on Chapter 1.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Program Management

- The Department published final regulations for 34 C.F.R., Parts 200 and 204, implementing the changes enacted in the 1983 technical amendments (P.L. 98-211) on May 19, 1986.
- During FY 1986, the Department conducted 24 onsite State reviews of the LEA grant program portion of Chapter 1. The review teams found that local Chapter 1 programs generally are in compliance with the Chapter 1 requirements and that their fiscal accounting practices, computer data management practices, and quality control procedures for LEA evaluation data reporting at the SEA level were satisfactory (E.1).
- The Department issued guidance concerning the effect of the Aguilar v. Felton decision on Chapter 1 programs for children attending private schools in August and September 1985 and in June 1986.
- The Department received, processed, and investigated complaints from 13 States, involving more than 50 LEAs, alleging failure to provide equitable services to children in parochial schools. Ten have been resolved and three remain under investigation.
- The Department provided assistance in five court cases involving requests for delays in implementing Felton requirements, with delays being granted to a total of 26 districts.

Program Improvement

- The Department helped SEAs and LEAs improve their programs through the Secretary's Initiative to Improve the Education of Disadvantaged Children. In FY 1986, the Department (1) sponsored a national program to identify unusually successful programs serving disadvantaged children, which identified 130 effective projects (in addition to the 116 recognized in FY 1985); (2) published a two-volume Effective Compensatory Education Sourcebook (E.5) designed to disseminate program improvement strategies and profiles of successful projects; (3) provided technical assistance to LEAs to implement program improvement strategies; and (4) provided technical assistance to recognized projects to disseminate effective instructional practices.

- On May 19, 1986, the Department issued revised Chapter 1 regulations to require LEAs to develop written policies to ensure that parents of children being served have an adequate opportunity to participate in the design and implementation of the LEA's Chapter 1 project. The new regulations suggest a number of specific activities an LEA may consider in developing written policies for parental participation.

- The Department issued a memorandum to the State Chapter 1 coordinators encouraging them to include the educational needs of preschool children in developing their priorities under Chapter 1.

Program Evaluation

- State Performance Report forms (E.2) were revised to collect information on participants' sex, race, and age (as required by P.L. 98-211). All Title I/ Chapter 1 demographic and achievement data from 1979-80 through 1983-84 are now available in personal computer disk format, for ready use by SEAs, LEAs, or researchers with an interest in longitudinal data analyses at the State and national level. Data from 1984-85 are being compiled and will be available around November 1986.

- The Department issued a memorandum to State Chapter 1 coordinators encouraging the States to use an annual test cycle rather than a fall-to-spring test cycle in evaluating the impact of their programs, because an annual cycle results in more credible estimates of achievement gain.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The most recent data about this program are from the 1984-85 academic year. Although a full analysis of 1984-85 data will not be completed until November 1986, a preliminary analysis of descriptive information follows.

In academic year 1984-85:

- Approximately $3.0 billion was distributed to LEAs.

- According to State reports, about 4,920,000 children received Chapter 1 services. Of that number, approximately 4,735,000 attended public schools and 185,000 attended private schools. Participation of private school children in Chapter 1 declined by more than 18 percent from academic year 1983-84; however, this decline was due primarily to the fact that California had reported an additional 30,000 private school children in that one year.

Distribution of Funds: In FY 1985 (E.3):

- Chapter 1 grants were awarded to 83 percent of all LEAs, but additional LEAs received funds or services through intermediate agencies or LEA cooperatives. Overall, the Department estimates that between 87 and 88 percent of the LEAs received Chapter 1 funding or services.
- Virtually all LEAs that had 5,000 or more children received grants, compared with less than two-thirds of the LEAs that had fewer than 300 children.
- The least poor quarter of LEAs (based on the percentage of children living in families with incomes below the poverty line in 1979) received about $258 million -- about 9 percent of the total amount of Chapter 1 formula grants to LEAs.
- The typical (median) grant award was $57,223.

Children Served: Children from prekindergarten through the 12th grade received services in 1984-85, with the largest proportion in grades 1 through 6, as shown in Table 1. These percentages have changed very little from prior years.

Table 1

NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED, 1984-85 ACADEMIC YEAR

Grade Span	Number	Percentage
Prekindergarten and Kindergarten	365,250	7
Grades 1-3	1,835,087	37
Grades 4-6	1,563,065	32
Grades 7-9	900,479	18
Grades 10-12	256,643	6
Total	4,921,067	100

Note: There were 543 students in ungraded classes who are included in the total but not in the grade-level counts. Moreover, California reported serving 843,492 public school students, but this figure includes children served either by Chapter 1 or by the State's compensatory education program. We estimate that between 40 and 50 percent of these children are served by state compensatory education and not directly by Chapter 1. In effect, this correction would reduce the participation in California to approximately 500,000 public school students and would reduce the total number served nationwide to approximately 4.6 million. For consistency, similar reductions should also be made in the data reported for previous years.

Race/Ethnicity: Table 2 provides the 1984-85 data that States reported on the racial/ethnic composition of Chapter 1 participants (only two States, New York and Vermont, did not provide racial/ethnic breakdowns).

Table 2

DISTRIBUTION OF CHAPTER 1 PARTICIPANTS BY RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUP, 1984-85 ACADEMIC YEAR

Race/Ethnicity	Percentage of Chapter 1 Participants
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2
Asian/Pacific Islander	3
Black, not Hispanic	29
Hispanic	22
White, not Hispanic	44

Gender. As required by the Technical Amendments to Chapter 1, data were collected on the gender of participating children. In 1984-85, approximately 55 percent of Chapter 1 students were male and 45 percent female.

Types of Benefits Provided: Students received services in a variety of instructional and support areas, as shown in Table 3. During the 1984-85 academic year, the most common service areas were reading (77 percent of all Chapter 1 students), mathematics (46 percent), and other language arts (23 percent). Data were not collected on the percentage of children with limited English proficiency who received instruction.

Table 3

NUMBER OF CHILDREN RECEIVING SERVICES BY SERVICE AREA, 1984-85 ACADEMIC YEAR

Service Area	Number	Percent [a]
Instructional		
Reading	3,794,497	77
Mathematics	2,246,842	46
Language arts	1,122,927	23
Other instructional	349,466	7
Supporting		
Attendance, guidance	770,702	16
Health, nutrition	638,913	13
Transportation	191,233	4
Other supporting	280,952	6

a. Percentages are calculated using the total number of students served by the program (4,921,067). Students may receive services in more than one area.

In general, participation patterns for 1984-85 indicated that more children participated in basic instructional programs (reading, mathematics, and language arts) than in previous years, and fewer children received other instructional or supporting services.

Staffing: Local project funds supported approximately 163,599 full-time-equivalent (FTE) staff positions during the 1984-85 academic year, a rise of 5.5 percent above the 1983-84 figure. As in previous years, the majority of staff were either teachers (45 percent) or teacher aides (39 percent). Administrators constituted only 3 percent of the full-time-equivalent Chapter 1 staff.

Student Achievement: The data on student achievement for academic year 1984-85 will not be available until November 1986.

Program Audits: As a result of a Department audit completed in FY 1986, a final determination letter was issued requiring a refund of $35,967 for costs claimed in excess of actual expenditures; the State fully refunded the amount. In addition, the Department also issued final determinations on 12 State organizationwide audits conducted by non-Federal auditors, which included findings concerning Title I and Chapter 1 grants. The Department's determinations on these audits required refunds of $784,635.

D. Highlights of Activities

The National Assessment of Compensatory Education: A "National Assessment of Compensatory Education" was mandated in the 1983 ECIA technical amendments. The Department's Office of Educational Research and Improvement is managing this study, which responds to the mandate to conduct independent studies and analyses and to report the findings to Congress by January 1987. The first interim report, summarized below, analyzes available information about the population of students whom Chapter 1 is intended to serve--educationally deprived students residing in areas with high concentrations of children from low-income families.

A second interim report, to be delivered in late 1986, will describe current knowledge about what constitutes effective compensatory education practice. The final report will describe--

- The quantity and characteristics of services being provided;
- The methods that school districts use to select schools and students to participate in the program, and the net effect of those decisions;
- The methods used to design programs and to allocate funds among schools; and
- The administration of the programs at each level of government.

The first report of the study, Poverty, Achievement and the Distribution of Compensatory Education Services, was delivered to the Congress in January 1986 (E.4). The highlights of the report included the following:

- Although research has shown that families' official poverty status is only weakly related to student achievement, it was found that as children's families experienced longer spells of poverty, the children were increasingly likely to fall behind grade level, and as the proportion of poor children in a school increased, achievement scores of all students--not just poor students--declined.

- Children who experienced long-term family poverty and children who lived in areas with high concentrations of poverty were more likely to belong to minority groups, live in the Southeast, and live in small rural areas or large urban areas.

- Children who lacked reading proficiency were more likely to live in rural or large urban areas and to have less-educated parents.

- The preponderance of black children, and minority children in general, among those experiencing long-term family poverty and concentrations of poverty in their communities suggests that they may be experiencing a form of poverty different from the poverty that nonminority or "transiently" poor children experience.

- Chapter 1's provisions for the selection of schools and students do not always ensure that the most educationally deprived students will be served. Nearly 20 percent of those students receiving instruction in math under Title I in 1976 achieved above the 50th percentile, and 10 percent of those receiving reading instruction in 1976 achieved above the 50th percentile; however, 60 percent of students scoring below the 25th percentile did not receive Title I services. Although these data are a decade old, more recent data sources indicate that similar patterns of achievement levels exist among Chapter 1 students today.

- The proportion of marginally low-achieving children who nevertheless receive compensatory education services depended in part on the population of low-achieving students available to be served by the school, and in part on the local decision to serve many rather than only a few children. Schools with fewer lower-achieving students, and schools with relatively large programs, were more likely to serve higher-achieving students, unless they had very high concentrations of poor students.

Other Highlights: The Administration introduced the Equity and Choice Act (TEACH), which would permit the parents of children selected to participate in the Chapter 1 program to use a voucher to obtain educational services that best meet their children's needs, at the public or private school of their choice.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. State Performance Reports, 1979-80 through 1984-85.

2. State Audit Reports. U.S. Department of Education.

3. Distribution of State-Administered Federal Education Funds: Tenth Annual Report (Required by Section 406A, General Education Provisions Act). U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., August 1986.

4. Poverty, Achievement and the Distribution of Compensatory Education Services. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Washington, D.C., January 1986.

5. Effective Compensatory Education Sourcebook, Vols. I and II. U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., June 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The following contracted studies have been commissioned as part of the "National Assessment of Compensatory Education":

- A Study of Targeting Practices Used in the Chapter 1 Program (SRA Technologies, Mountain View, Calif.);
- A Survey of Chapter 1 Schools and Teachers (Westat Inc., Rockville, Md.);
- A Study of the Whole-Day Instructional Experiences of Chapter 1 Students (Far West Educational Laboratory, San Francisco, Calif.);
- A Study of the Costs of Special Education Services, Amended to Include Costs of Chapter 1 Services (Decision Resources, Washington, D.C.);
- A Study of How Districts Allocate Resources Among Schools (Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.);
- A Study of School District Program Design Decision-Making (SRI International, Menlo Park, Calif.);
- A Study of Local Implementation of ECIA Chapter 1 (Research and Evaluation Associates, Chapel Hill, N.C.);
- A Study of Administration (Abt Associates, Cambridge, Mass.);
- An NCES Fast Response Survey of Chapter 1 Oversight (National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, D.C.);
- Analysis of School District and State Education Agency Records (multiple awards);
- Effects of Alternative Designs in Compensatory Education (Research and Evaluation Associates, Chapel Hill, N.C.);
- Data Analysis and Technical Support (Decision Resources, Washington, D.C.).

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Mary Jean LeTendre, (202) 245-8720

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Notes

1. Excludes Special Incentive Grants and State-operated programs (which include the Migrant Education Program, the Program for Neglected or Delinquent Children, and the Program for Handicapped Children).
2. Reflects reduction made pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (P.L. 99-177).

MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM (CHAPTER 1, ECIA)
FORMULA GRANTS TO STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES TO MEET THE SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN
(CFDA No. 84.011)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), Chapter 1, P.L. 97-35, as amended (20 U.S.C. 3851) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$255,744,000 1/	$255,744,000
1983	255,744,000 1/	255,744,000
1984	Indefinite	258,024,000
1985	Indefinite	264,524,000
1986	Indefinite	253,149,000

Purpose: To establish and improve programs to meet the special educational needs of migratory children of migratory agricultural workers or fishers.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives for this program were:

- To monitor ongoing projects and to award grants for school year 1986-87 projects, and
- To analyze the findings of the State performance reports.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department conducted 17 onsite State program reviews. The Department awarded 52 Basic grants to the States ranging from $39,545 to $74,927,496. It also awarded 20 Interstate and Intrastate Coordination grants to 10 States at an average cost of $140,600.
- The Department began the analysis of the FY 1985 State performance reports, the first systematic reports of migrant education performance and achievement data submitted by the States. (The results of this analysis will be available in FY 1987.)

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The following table indicates the number of full-time-equivalent students registered on the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) since 1977. These counts serve as the basis for program funding. One fulltime equivalent equals 365 days of enrollment on the MSRTS. A count of the actual number of students identified as eligible for services and enrolled on the MSRTS is also shown.

Calendar Year	Full-Time-Equivalent Students (ages 5-17)	Number of Eligible Students (under 21 years of age)
1977	296,430	467,796
1978	323,501	494,417
1979	366,460	522,154
1980	398,798	550,253
1981	417,298	577,483
1982	426,729	593,042
1983	407,650	566,422
1984	387,943	533,966
1985	382,253	530,367

Program Effectiveness: In FY 1986, the Department began the systematic analysis and synthesis of the FY 1985 State performance reports. Participation and achievement information from this analysis will be available in early 1987. In addition, in FY 1986, the Department, as part of its responsibilities under GEPA 406(a), collected, analyzed, and reported information about the distribution of Migrant Education Program funds to subgrantees. (E.1.)

D. Highlights of Activities

In FY 1986, the Department sponsored a second year of the Chapter 1 Recognition Program to identify and disseminate information about unusually successful Chapter 1 projects. Nine local Migrant Education projects were among the 130 Chapter 1 projects identified by the Department as unusually successful. A Sourcebook describing these projects will be available in FY 1987.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Distribution of State-Administered Federal Education Funds: Tenth Annual Report, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., August 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The Department is now conducting three small analyses of the program. As mentioned in Part II. B. and C. above, the Department is now analyzing and synthesizing information from the FY 1985 State performance reports. The Department is also conducting an examination of the operations and products of the Interstate and Intrastate Coordination grants program. Finally, case studies of State and local program operations and student characteristics are being conducted in six States during 1986-87. Results from these three studies will be available in early 1987.

In addition, under the provisions of Section 143(a), the Department is planning a study to examine and improve the States' identification and recruitment practices. The results of this study will be available in early FY 1988.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: John Staehle, (202) 245-2722

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Note

1. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 capped the authorization for the State-operated programs at 14.6 percent of the total amount appropriated for Chapter 1. This cap remained in effect through FY 1983.

FORMULA GRANTS TO STATES FOR NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT CHILDREN
(CFDA No. 84.013)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), enacted as part of Subtitle D, Title V, of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 2781) as amended (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$32,616,000 1/	$32,616,000
1983	32,616,000 1/	32,616,000
1984	Indefinite	32,616,000
1985	Indefinite	32,616,000
1986	Indefinite	31,214,000 2/

Purpose: To provide financial assistance to meet the special educational needs of children in institutions for neglected or delinquent children or children in adult correctional institutions, for whom a State agency is directly responsible for providing free public education. The programs and projects provided must be designed to support educational services supplemental to the basic education of such children, which must be provided by the State agency. State agencies directly responsible for providing free public education to children in institutions for neglected or delinquent children may receive grants.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objective for this program was to develop nonregulatory guidance for State agencies' services to children in institutions for neglected or delinquent children.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

o Nonregulatory guidance for institutions for neglected and delinquent children was drafted.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: States are required to submit annual information on the number of students served by the program. On the basis of information received, the program served an estimated 56,000 students in the 1984-85 school year, at a cost of approximately $580 per student. Approximately 90 percent of the students are male. The majority--about 60 percent--are in facilities for the delinquent, about 35 percent are in adult correctional facilities, and about 5 percent are in facilities for neglected children.

Program Effectiveness: Each State education agency (SEA) is required to conduct an evaluation at least once every two years and to make public the results of that evaluation. The SEAs are not required to provide these reports to the Department of Education.

D. Highlights of Activities

The Secretary recognized five projects for neglected or delinquent children as unusually successful under the Secretary's Initiative to Improve the Education of Disadvantaged Children. Three of the projects recognized in FY 1985 are profiled in the Effective Compensatory Education Source book, Vol. II.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "A Summary of 1984-85 State Evaluation Reports." U.S. Department of Education (available in early 1987).
2. "An Analysis of the ECIA Chapter 1 State Program for Neglected or Delinquent Children." Policy Studies Associates, Inc. Washington, D.C., June 1986.
3. Effective Compensatory Education Sourcebook, Vol. II: Project Profiles. U.S. Department of Education, 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A recent study (E.2) of the program, which relied on existing documents, interviews with staff in nine States, and three site visits in each of three States, found that the Chapter 1 program for neglected or delinquent children most frequently provides supplementary reading, language arts, and mathematics instruction through small, pull-out classes. In the nine facilities studied, the typical recipient of these services was a male in his middle to late teens. Many of the students had previously dropped out of school, and a large number had achievement scores far below the average for their age group. Few of the students received transitional services after leaving the institutions.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Mary Jean LeTendre, (202) 245-8720

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Notes

1. The Omnibus Budget Reconcilitation Act of 1981 capped the authorization for the State-operated programs at 14.6 percent of the total appropriated for Chapter 1. This cap remained in effect through FY 1983. In fiscal years 1984 and 1985, Congress appropriated funds in the absence of a specified authorization level.

2. The final allocation reflects a 4.3 percent reduction resulting from the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings "Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985."

EDUCATION BLOCK GRANT (CHAPTER 2, ECIA)
CONSOLIDATION OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS
(CFDA No. 84.151)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), Chapter 2, P.L. 97-35, as amended (20 U.S.C. 3811-3876) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 1/
1982	$589,368,000	$442,176,000
1983	589,368,000	450,655,000
1984	589,368,000	450,655,000
1985	Indefinite	500,000,000
1986	Indefinite	478,403,125

Purpose: To help State education agencies (SEAs) and local education agencies (LEAs) improve elementary and secondary education, through consolidation of 42 elementary and secondary education programs into a single authorization and to reduce paperwork and assign responsibility for the design and implementation of Chapter 2 programs to LEAs. SEAs have the basic responsibility for the administration and supervision of Chapter 2 programs.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The Department's principal objectives for this program in FY 1986 were as follows:

- To begin followup, onsite program reviews of all States to obtain information about State implementation of recommended changes in program administration, and to recommend additional changes if the State is not complying with the statute or the regulations;
- To provide technical assistance to State Chapter 2 coordinators about program administration;
- To receive State application amendments for FY 1987, to approve revised State funding distribution criteria for the 1986-87 school year, and to issue grant awards by July 1, 1986; and
- To expand the Nonregulatory Guidance to include questions and answers that respond to findings of the program reviews.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Department staff completed program reviews in 15 States, as part of a team review process involving ECIA Chapter 2, Title IV of the Civil Rights Act and Title II of the Education for Economic Security Act.

- Department staff conducted a national meeting of State Chapter 2 Coordinators in February 1986. A compilation of all the findings of the first cycle of program reviews was distributed to participants.

- The Department processed all State applications and revisions of distribution criteria, and issued grant awards by July 1, 1986.

- Department staff compiled questions to be addressed in the Nonregulatory Guidance.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope

SEA Use of Funds: During FY 1985, the third year of program operations, States reserved for their own use more than $96 million (19.4 percent of the total granted to States). Of this amount, States allocated 12.2 percent for general administration, 7.8 percent for Subchapter A (Basic Skills), 73.2 percent for Subchapter B (Educational Improvement and Support), and 6.7 percent for Subchapter C (Special Projects) (E.1).

In a study to determine specific State administrative uses of Chapter 2 funds conducted in two States by the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO), the GAO reported that it was unable to estimate the amount of block grant funds used for purely administrative activities, as opposed to, for instance, programmatic or organizational support activities. GAO cited the absence of standardized definitions of administration and the different ways in which States accounted for their funds as the reasons why estimates of specific administrative costs could not be generated (E.2).

LEA Use of Funds: Ninety-nine percent of the Nation's school districts received Chapter 2 funds in FY 1985, totaling approximately $350 million. Eighty-eight percent of the districts with eligible private schools provided services to private school students; on average, 14 percent of a district's Chapter 2 funds supported these services. The median district allocation for the Nation was $6,422, with grant amounts averaging $7 to $9 per child.

Districts tended to use their Chapter 2 funds for six purposes, in the following proportions:

- One-third for computer applications (including hardware and software);

- One-third for libraries/media centers (including materials and equipment); and

- One-third evenly divided among curriculum development, staff development, instructional services, and student support services (E.3).

A comparison with the antecedent programs to Chapter 2 showed that a larger percentage of districts were supporting more kinds of activities, on average, under Chapter 2. Computer applications had increased more than threefold by the 1984-85 school year; staff development and instructional services were supported twice as often. Support for libraries and media centers was the only activity area supported by fewer districts under the block grant. A key point, and basic fact, about the block grant is that the vast majority of funds were used for instructional activities and instructional support. Only a small percentage of districts devoted these dollars to noninstructional activities such as administration.

Program Effectiveness

A two-year study of school districts' administrative and programmatic activities supported under ECIA Chapter 2, conducted by SRI International, was completed in March 1986. Products of the study included a descriptive report covering all aspects of the study (E.3), five in-depth special topic reports, and an evaluation handbook designed to help State and local Chapter 2 coordinators and evaluators conduct useful evaluations of their programs.

The major findings of the study were as follows:

- In its third year of operation (FY 1985), Chapter 2 has largely achieved its statutory goals of--
  - Contributing to educational improvement (through the introduction of new technology and the support of curriculum development),
  - Reducing local administrative burden (on average, only 5 percent of local Chapter 2 funds are used for administration) and providing local discretion in the use of funds, and
  - Increasing the participation of private school students.
- Nationally, Chapter 2 activities tend to serve all types of students, focusing neither on particular grade levels nor on particular student groups. Within districts, activities are often targeted to particular types of students; for instance, gifted and talented students are likely to be the focus of curriculum development, whereas economically and educationally disadvantaged students tend to receive instructional services.
- Chapter 2 has fully or partially supported the introduction of computer technology into three-quarters of the Nation's school districts. These computers are viewed as a new means of instruction, are actively used, and are generating considerable excitement among students and staff.
- More than 75 percent of all districts gained funds under the Chapter 2 program compared with its 28 antecedent programs that were funded in 1981. The smaller districts were most likely to gain; districts that experienced a funding loss included former Emergency School Assistance Act recipients and districts that had been notably successful in competitive, discretionary grants programs.

- Districts support more kinds of activities under Chapter 2 than they did under the antecedents; the trend toward diversification has become more pronounced with each succeeding year. The limiting factor seems to be grant size, as larger districts tend to have more activities than small ones.

- Direct parent and citizen involvement in Chapter 2 decisionmaking has not been fully achieved, although community preferences do influence district program decisions.

- Forty-two percent of all districts have eligible private schools, and 88 percent of these districts provided services to private school students, predominantly in the libraries/media centers and computer applications categories. The amount of money spent nationally on services to private school students is three times the total under the antecedent programs.

- Interactions between districts and their State educational agencies (SEAs) are usually trouble-free and mainly involve procedural matters. Districts' concerns over monitoring or auditing are minimal, in part because such activities have not yet occurred and in part because, where monitoring does occur, SEAs are following well-established (and understood) practices.

- Chapter 2 contributes to educational improvement in three ways: through the provision of new instructional equipment and materials; through improvement of curriculum and teaching staff competency; and through the provision of services to students.

D. Highlights of Activities

The Nonregulatory Guidance (NRG) for Chapter 2 was revised to strengthen requirements for parental participation in decisions about how Chapter 2 funds are to be used and in the design, planning, and implementation of those programs. The NRG section on private school participation was also expanded to provide better guidance on appropriate services and administrative practice.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. State Chapter 2 applications and evaluation reports, 1985.
2. "Education Block Grant: How Funds Reserved for State Efforts in California and Washington Are Used." U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C., May 1986.
3. "A National Study of Local Operations Under Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA)." SRI International, Menlo Park, Calif., March 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of the Chapter 2 program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Allen J. King, (202) 732-4064

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Note

1. Does not include funds appropriated for the Secretary's Discretionary Fund.

GENERAL ASSISTANCE TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
(No CFDA number)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education Amendments of 1978, Title XV, Part C, Section 1524, P.L. 95-561, as amended by the Education Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-511 (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$2,700,000	$1,920,000
1983	2,700,000	1,920,000
1984	2,700,000	1,920,000
1985	5,000,000	2,700,000
1986	5,000,000	4,784,000

Purpose: To provide general assistance to improve public education in the Virgin Islands.

Eligibility: Only the Virgin Islands is eligible for funds. This direct entitlement program is administered by a signed agreement between the U.S. Department of Education and the Department of Education of the Virgin Islands.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The FY 1986 application from the Virgin Islands identified the following objectives:

- To correct an asbestos health hazard in all public education facilities; and
- To upgrade physical facilities; to renovate, construct, and maintain classrooms and other educational facilities; and to perform additional needed repairs.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Program records show that in FY 1986 the following activities were accomplished:

- Asbestos abatement plans and designs were completed for three elementary schools.
- Roof repairs were completed on one elementary school.
- Equipment and a fire and alarm security system were installed in a curriculum center.

- o General maintenance and repairs were performed at various schools.
- o Major plant improvements were made, an intercom system was installed, and other repairs were 50 percent completed at one high school.
- o Installation of a standby generator and school lunch freezer was 90 percent completed at a curriculum center.
- o Preliminary work began on installation of a security system and an intercom for new classes and other repairs at one junior high school.

C. Costs and Benefits

No new information.

D. Highlights of Activities

The program has been reauthorized through FY 1989 by P.L. 98-511.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

Program grantee files.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are under way.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Ron Davis, (202) 732-4156

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

CIVIL RIGHTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING
(CFDA No 84.004)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV, P.L. 88-352 (42 U.S.C. 2000c-2000c-5) (no expiration date).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$37,100,000	$24,000,000
1983	37,100,000	24,000,000
1984	37,100,000	24,000,000
1985	Indefinite	24,000,000
1986	Indefinite	22,963,350

Purpose: To provide technical assistance, training, and advisory services to school districts that are coping with the special educational problems caused by the desegregation of elementary and secondary schools with respect to race, sex, and national origin. In FY 1986, the Department made awards under two Title IV programs: State education agency (SEA) projects and desegregation assistance centers (DACs).

Eligibility: All SEAs are eligible for the SEA grants program. Any public agency (other than a State or local education agency) or private, nonprofit agency is eligible for a DAC grant.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To increase the number of SEAs participating in this program and their capacity for assisting desegregating school districts within their States, and
- To strengthen cooperation among DACs and SEAs.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The number of SEA awards made between FY 1985 and 1986 increased from 109 to 112.
- Each DAC continuation application includes provisions for strengthening cooperation between the DACs and SEAs.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: SEA and DAC grants are awarded separately in the areas of sex, race, and national origin. The following table presents data on FY 1986 Title IV awards (E.1):

Category of Grant	Total Applications	Total Awards	Percentage of Applicants Funded	Total Obligation	Average Award
Race					
DAC	17	17	100%	$ 4,327,859	$254,580
SEA	34	33	97%	4,643,148	140,701
Sex					
DAC	12	12	100%	2,402,066	200,172
SEA	44	43	98%	4,817,505	112,035
National Origin					
DAC	11	11	100%	2,835,425	257,766
SEA	36	36	100%	3,937,347	109,371
TOTAL	154	152	100%	$22,963,350	
DAC	40	40	100%	9,565,350	239,134
SEA	114	112	99%	13,398,000	119,625

Program Effectiveness: No new information is available (see FY 1985 AER for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

The Department continues to emphasize capacity building within SEAs.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program files.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of the program are ongoing or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Curtis F. Coates, (202) 245-2181

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

FOLLOW THROUGH--GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES AND OTHER PUBLIC AND PRIVATE NONPROFIT AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND INSTITUTIONS TO PROVIDE COMPREHENSIVE SERVICES TO LOW-INCOME CHILDREN IN THE PRIMARY GRADES
(CFDA No. 84-014)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Follow Through Act; Subchapter C of Chapter 8 of Subtitle A of Title VI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35 (42 U.S.C. 9861 *et seq.*).[1/]

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$44,300,000	$19,440,000
1983	22,150,000	19,440,000
1984	14,767,000	14,767,000
1985	10,000,000	10,000,000
1986	7,500,000	7,176,000

Purposes: To assist the overall development of children from low-income families enrolled in kindergarten through third grade and to amplify the education gains made by such children in Head Start and other preschool programs of similar quality by (1) implementing innovative educational approaches; (2) providing comprehensive support services; (3) conducting the programs in a context of effective community service and parental involvement; and (4) documenting those models found to be effective.

Eligibility: Since 1972, grants have been made only on a continuation basis; hence to be eligible for a Follow Through grant an applicant must have received a Follow Through grant the preceding fiscal year.

Program Activities: Follow Through provides discretionary grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to operate projects; to institutions of higher education and regional laboratories to develop and sponsor the instructional models used in Follow Through sites; and to selected local projects to conduct demonstration activities. For each project, an LEA is required to use an innovative instructional model; to provide comprehensive services and special activities in the areas of physical and mental health, social services, nutrition, and other areas that supplement basic services already available; to conduct the program with effective community service and parental involvement; and to provide documentation on those models that are found to be effective. Some large districts use more than one model and thus have multiple projects.

The full range of instructional and support services has had to be reduced to support continued funding of all existing grantees that reapply, following appropriation reductions since FY 1984.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

- To provide timely review of grant continuation proposals.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- During FY 1986 awards were made to 55 LEAs, 12 model sponsors, and 16 resource centers.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Follow Through currently serves approximately 20,000 children at a cost of about $500 per child. In FY 1986, the program committed funds as follows:

55 LEAs	$5,822,364
12 Model Sponsors	870,892
16 Resource Centers	482,291
TOTAL	$7,175,547

Program Effectiveness: No current information is available.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Follow Through grantee reports, 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)

No contracted studies of this program are planned or are in progress.

The sum of $314,681 from the FY 1986 appropriation, an amount available because five grantees did not reapply, was granted to the Model Sponsors to support production of a comprehensive report on the contributions of Follow Through to compensatory education. The report is due in September 1987.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Bruce Gaarder, (202) 245-2335

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Note

1. Section 561(a) of Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (20 U.S.C. 3811[a]) consolidated Follow Through into the Chapter 2 block grant program on a phased basis, but Follow Through has subsequently been reauthorized as a categorical program through FY 1990.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS (IMPACT AID): MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS (CFDA No. 84.041)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas Act, P.L. 81-874 (20 U.S.C. 236), as amended by P.L. 95-561, 97-35, 98-94 and 98-511 (expires September 30, 1988).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$455,000,000	$437,800,000
1983	455,000,000	460,200,000 1/
1984	565,000,000	580,000,000 2/
1985	740,000,000	675,000,000
1986	760,000,000	665,975,000 3/

Purpose: To help compensate local education agencies (LEAs) for the loss of taxable property and for the cost of educating additional children when enrollments and the availability of revenues from local sources have been adversely affected by Federal activities, and to help LEAs affected by natural disasters.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives were to implement the provisions of P.L. 81-874, as amended, and to publish regulations governing the eligibility of LEAs for payments under Section 3 of P.L. 81-874.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

For 1986, the Impact Aid program assisted LEAs serving 330,000 children who lived on Federal property and who had parents working on Federal property or in the uniformed services under Section 3(a). The program assisted 1,700,000 children who lived on Federal property or who had parents working on Federal property or in the uniformed services under Section 3(b). Payments were made under Section 2 to approximately 260 LEAs that contain substantial amounts of federally owned, tax-exempt property. Disaster assistance funds were provided to 104 LEAs in 16 States.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1986, 2,761 LEAs have received payments under Sections 2 and 3 to date, compared with 2,975 in FY 1985.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1982 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

The Department published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking governing the eligibility of LEAs to claim children for payments under Section 3.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

Pelavin Associates, under contract with the Department, completed five case studies of districts that have large proportions of students whose parents work for the Federal Government or are in the uniformed services, and that have substantial areas of tax-exempt Federal property within their boundaries. Each study examines the fiscal circumstances of the district, the quality of its educational program, and the adequacy of its Impact Aid payment. In addition to examining resource documents and conducting site visits, the contractor developed two alternative methods for calculating potential district revenues: (1) a standard expenditure level, based on educational expenditures in comparable school districts and (2) an alternative land use standard, based on revenues generated by land not owned by the Federal Government in comparable school districts.

The studies demonstrate that the level of local tax effort, educational expenditures, and quality of education vary in each district and that judgments about the adequacy of Impact Aid payments to each district depend on which method for calculating potential revenue is used and what comparison districts are employed in the analysis.

The General Accounting Office, at the request of Congress, completed another study related to the Impact Aid program in 1986. This study examined alternatives to funding the schools under Section 6, which typically serve children living on military installations. When Section 6 arrangements were initially made, public schools were either unavailable or inappropriate. Because Section 6 requires a substantial annual investment of Federal funds, the Congress wanted to consider alternative ways of educating these children. The GAO study considers the effects of transferring the responsibility for the children served under Section 6 to neighboring public school districts.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Stan Kruger, (202) 732-3637

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Notes

1. Amount provided by the 1983 Continuing Resolutions.
2. Includes $15 million supplemental appropriation for disaster assistance.
3. Includes $20 million supplemental appropriation for disaster assistance.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS (IMPACT AID): CONSTRUCTION (CFDA No. 84.040)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas Act, P.L. 81-815 (20 U.S.C. 631-645, 647) as amended by P.L. 95-561, 97-35, 98-8, and 98-511 (no expiration).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$20,000,000	$19,200,000
1983	20,000,000	80,000,000 1/
1984	20,000,000	20,000,000
1985	Indefinite	20,000,000
1986	Indefinite	16,747,500

Purpose: To construct and repair or provide grants to local education agencies (LEAs) for the construction of urgently needed minimum school facilities when enrollments and the availability of revenues from local sources have been adversely affected by Federal activities.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objective was to implement the provisions of P.L. 81-815, as amended.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

During FY 1986, program funds provided direct assistance to three LEAs, including one new and two ongoing school construction projects. Twenty-five projects were funded to carry out emergency repairs on federally owned school buildings.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1986, this program funded a total of 28 projects.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1982 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS [Response to GEPA 417(b)]

None.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Stan Kruger, (202) 732-3637

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Note

1. Amounts provided by the 1983 Continuing Resolution and Jobs Bill Supplemental Appropriation.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER FELLOWSHIPS
(CFDA No. 84.148)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Allen J. Ellender Fellowship Program, P.L. 92-506--Joint Resolution of October 19, 1972, as amended (86 Stat. 907-908) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$1,000,000	$ 960,000
1983	1,000,000	3,000,000 1/
1984	1,500,000	1,500,000
1985	1,500,000	1,500,000
1986	2,000,000	1,627,000

Purpose: To make a grant to the Close Up Foundation of Washington, D.C., for fellowships to disadvantaged secondary school students and their teachers in schools throughout the country and Puerto Rico and overseas schools of the Department of Defense, to enable them to learn about representative government and the democratic process.

Eligibility: Economically disadvantaged secondary school students and their teachers are eligible to apply for fellowships from the Close Up Foundation. Fellowships are awarded annually on the basis of equitable geographic distribution and community interest.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

For FY 1986, the Department's principal objective was to award funds to the Close Up Foundation so that it could provide fellowships for low-income secondary school students and their teachers.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The Department awarded this grant in FY 1986 as scheduled.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The program consists of a week-long series of meetings, seminars, and workshops with Members of Congress, members of the Executive and Judicial branches of government, congressional committee staff members, lobbyists, reporters, foreign government representatives, and others. Since the program began, approximately 167,900 students and teachers from 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Department of Defense Overseas Schools have participated in the Washington Close Up Program. Students from schools for the hearing and visually impaired across the Nation also participated.

Since 1979, in an effort to reach additional secondary school students and teachers with citizenship education programs, the Close Up Foundation has telecast Washington Seminars over Cable TV (C-SPAN). The seminars included discussions between Washington leaders and high school students, many of whom were Ellender Fellowship recipients. More than 3,500 secondary schools have access to these programs.

Close Up also publishes materials including a Teachers Guide to C-SPAN; Current Issues, a book that examines contemporary questions; Perspectives, a book of readings on government operations with articles by leaders in Congress, the executive and judicial branches, and elsewhere; The Washington Notebook, a workbook designed to help prepare students for their Washington experience; and U.S.-Soviet Relations.

Program Effectiveness: No new information.

D. Highlights of Activities

Fellowships under this program were made to approximately 5,900 students and teachers in FY 1985. These grants, which included costs of room, board, tuition, administration, insurance, and transportation, averaged about $600 per participant. Of this amount, $275 was Federal money, and the rest was private matching funds.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

No new information.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Ann Mack, (202) 245-2465

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Note:

1. In 1983 the Congress appropriated a double amount in order to place the program on a forward-funded basis. The appropriation for 1983 provided $1.5 million for school year 1982-83 and $1.5 million for school year 1983-84.

INDIAN EDUCATION--FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES AND INDIAN-CONTROLLED SCHOOLS FOR THE EDUCATION OF INDIAN CHILDREN--PART A (CFDA Nos. 84.060 and 84.072)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Indian Education Act, P.L. 92-318, Title IV, Part A, as amended (20 U.S.C. 241aa-ff) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation
1982	$667,770,717	$54,960,000
1983	775,442,755	48,465,000
1984	814,200,000	50,900,000
1985	Indefinite	50,323,000
1986	Indefinite	47,870,000 2/

Purpose: Part A of the Indian Education Act supports programs to address the educational and culturally related academic needs of Indian students in public and tribal schools and in reservation-based, Indian-controlled schools. Objectives for the program include (1) improving academic performance in the basic skills; (2) reducing dropout rates and improving attendance; (3) increasing Indian parents' participation in educational policymaking; and (4) helping public schools become more responsive to the needs of Indian children.

Assistance to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and Tribal Schools: Part A grants are made on a formula basis to LEAs 1/. LEAs are eligible if they enroll at least 10 Indian children or if Indian children constitute at least 50 percent of the total enrollment. These limitations do not apply to LEAs located in Alaska, California, or Oklahoma, or to LEAs on or near an Indian reservation. Certain tribal schools are treated as LEAs and thus can receive formula grants under this program.

Assistance to Indian-Controlled Schools: The Indian-controlled schools program is authorized by a set-aside amount not to exceed 10 percent of the amount of the Part A formula program. Tribes and Indian organizations and certain LEAs that operate schools on or near reservations may compete for funds to develops special enrichment programs. Many, but not all, of these schools are also eligible for formula grants.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To improve plans in Part A projects.
- To correct problems associated with verification of student eligibility, and
- To audit at least one-third of the local Part A projects and to provide technical assistance as needed to correct specific deficiencies or to improve the overall effectiveness of local projects.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Technical assistance (Education Resource and Evaluation Center and Indian Education Program staff) has been focused on the improvement of evaluation plans and the identification of potential Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) submissions.
- Proposed regulations have been drafted to clarify policies and procedures concerning verification of student eligibility.
- In 1986, 376 projects, representing one-third of Part A grants, were audited. An Audit Report is being prepared for submission to the Congress.

C. Costs and Benefits

Students Served: In FY 1986, formula grants totaling nearly $44 million were awarded to 1,076 public and 57 Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) contract schools. Public school grantees served 236,863 students, and BIA schools served 10,491 students; the average award was $39,241, for an average expenditure per student of $184. An additional $4,195,000 went to 33 Indian-controlled schools serving 6,911 students; the average award was $127,121 and the average expenditure per student was $607.

Types of Services Provided: The most recent Audit Report submitted to the Congress describes the types of programs surveyed in FY 1985. Seventy-nine percent of the projects offered programs to improve academic skills and 69 percent offered cultural enrichment programs. Most projects that addressed the need to improve academic skills used tutorial services as all or a portion of their academic program. Math and reading tutorial services were found in 59 percent of the projects; social studies, in 35 percent; and writing, in 34 percent. Academic support services included personal counseling, career counseling, postsecondary education planning, health and related services, and home-school relations. (See E.1.)

Program Evaluation:

Program reviewers for the Audit recommended that 30 percent of the projects improve their evaluation methods to measure outcomes more effectively. The Department and the Education Resource and Evaluation Centers are providing workshops to help LEAs improve their needs assessment techniques and program design, and generally to develop better performance evaluation strategies to document program effectiveness.

Results from a study of Indian-controlled schools by Abt Associates, Inc., in 1985 found that student performance in the Indian-Controlled schools was about the same as those of students from comparable public schools, that student attendance in those schools was lower than in comparable public schools, and that student withdrawal rates were very high. Pupil-instructional staff ratios were very low (7 to 1) compared with those at the local public schools (16 to 1). Attendance varied greatly at the schools. Overall, the study found that although some of the schools were providing an education comparable to that provided at public schools or BIA-operated schools, others were definitely not.

Further information about program effectiveness based on the Impact Study of Part A programs in public schools was summarized in the Annual Evaluation Report for FY 1984.

D. Highlights of Activities

Various aspects of the program are being reviewed to help the Department determine the need for revised legislation and future budget levels.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Report to the Congress on the Annual Program Site Reviews for Fiscal Year 1984 Funds (School Year 1984-85), October 21, 1985.
2. An Evaluation of Indian-Controlled Schools. Abt Associates, Inc., December 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies are planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Hakim Khan, (202) 732-1887

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Notes

1. Authorization figures are based on a formula that weights Indian student counts by average per-pupil expenditures in the State. Actual grants are ratably reduced in proportion to the amount of the appropriation.
2. This reflects a reduction of $2,151,000 under the sequestered 1986 Budget Authority, for the original 1986 appropriation of $50,021,000.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR INDIAN STUDENTS--PART B
(CFDA Nos. 84.061 and 84.087)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Indian Education Act, Section 422, 423, and 1005, P.L. 92-318, Title IV, Part B, as amended (20 U.S.C. 3385 and 3385a and 3385b) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$37,000,000	$14,300,000
1983	37,000,000	12,600,000
1984	37,000,000	12,000,000
1985	37,000,000	11,760,000
1986	37,000,000	11,301,000 1/

Purpose: Part B authorizes a variety of discretionary programs designed to improve the quality of educational programs for Indians. Specific activities authorized under Part B include the following:

- Planning, pilot, and demonstration projects to plan for, test, and demonstrate the effectiveness of educational approaches for Indian students at the preschool, elementary, and secondary levels.
- Educational service projects to serve Indian preschool, elementary, and secondary school students if other educational programs or services are not available to them in sufficient quantity or quality. Eligible recipients are State education agencies (SEAs), local education agencies (LEAs), Indian tribes, organizations, and institutions.
- Educational personnel development projects to train Indians for careers in education. There are two programs: Section 1005(d), making awards primarily to universities, and Section 422, making awards primarily to Indian tribes and organizations.
- Fellowships for Indian students in the fields of medicine, psychology, law, education, business administration, engineering, and natural resources. Awards are based on financial need, academic record, other potential for success, and likelihood of service to Indians upon graduation. Priority is given to graduate students in business administration, engineering, natural resources, and related fields.
- Resource and Evaluation Centers to provide technical assistance and disseminate information to Indian education projects and applicants. The centers conduct workshops, make site visits, and prepare and distribute printed materials.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- o To support an appropriate mix of projects that address the full range of authorized activities, and
- o To improve the representation of Indians in specific professions through increased emphasis on graduate work in these fields.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o In FY 1986, 33 educational service projects, 25 planning, pilot, and demonstration projects, and 15 educational personnel development projects were awarded to LEAs, Indian tribes, Indian organizations, Indian institutions, and institutions of higher education. These projects covered early childhood programs, the training of teachers and administrators, outreach tutoring programs, and similar activities.
- o Of 160 fellowships awarded in FY 1986, 107 or 67 percent, were for graduate level work. Compared with FY 1985, this represents a 10 percent increase in the proportion of graduate awards. A few awards were still pending at the end of the fiscal year.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Part B funds supported 73 discretionary grants, more than 160 fellowships, and 5 Resource and Evaluation Centers. During the 1985-86 school year, these centers conducted 129 workshops and made approximately 425 site visits to provide technical assistance to Title IV grantees.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available. An internal review of Part B programs for measures of effectiveness is currently under way. Results will be available in the spring of 1987.

D and E.

No new information.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No new studies are planned or under way.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Hakim Kahn, (202) 732-1887

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Note

1. This reflects a reduction of $508,000 under the sequestered 1986 Budget Authority, from the original 1986 appropriation of $11,809,000.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR INDIAN ADULTS--PART C
(CFDA No. 84.062)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Indian Education Act, Section 315, P.L. 92-318, Title IV, Part C, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1211a) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$8,000,000	$5,430,000
1983	8,000,000	5,213,000
1984	8,000,000	5.531,000 1/
1985	8,000,000	2,940,000
1986	8,000,000	2,797,000 2/

Purpose: Part C authorizes a range of activities designed to improve educational opportunities below the college level for Indian adults. Program objectives include increasing literacy, improving basic skills, and increasing the number of Indian adults who pass the high school equivalency examination. Specific activities authorized by Part C include the following:

- Educational service projects to provide educational opportunities for Indian adults. Projects are focused on adult basic education to develop literacy and basic skills, and on secondary education. including preparation for the high school equivalency examination. Many projects also offer consumer education and special services needed by adult students. such as academic and career counseling, aptitude and vocational testing, and job referral.

- Planning, pilot, and demonstration projects to test and demonstrate innovative approaches to adult education specifically designed for Indian adults.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

In FY 1986, the Department's principal objective was to emphasize delivery of services, especially in areas where similar types of services are not already offered.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Educational services projects accounted for 41 percent of all FY 1986 Part C funds, compared with 40 percent the previous year.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Educational service awards totaling $1,149,121 were made in FY 1986. An additional $1,647,879 in awards went to support planning, pilot, and demonstration projects.

Program Effectiveness: Findings of a study completed in 1985 were reported in the Annual Evaluation Report for FY 1985.

D and E.

No new information.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No further studies are planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Hakim Kahn, (202) 732-1887

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Notes

1. Includes supplemental FY 1983 appropriation of $1,938,000 available until expended.

2. This reflects a reduction of $125,000 under the sequestered FY 1986 budget authority from the original FY 1986 appropriation of $2,922,000.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION PROGRAM
(No CFDA Number)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), Chapter 2, Subchapter D, P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 3851) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$3,000,000	$2,850,000
1983	1/	2,850,000
1984	1/	2,850,000
1985	1/	3,000,000
1986	1/	2,870,000

Purpose: To help schools and communities become aware of the complexity of the alcohol and drug abuse problem and to develop strategies that attack the causes of the problem rather than merely the symptoms. The program strongly encourages a coordinated school-community effort in preventive education, with an emphasis on reducing the socially disruptive behaviors often associated with abuse.

Method of Operation: Contracts are awarded to five Regional Training and Resource Centers. These centers award subcontracts to public school districts and private schools, which send school teams to be trained to develop and implement plans to solve their local alcohol and drug abuse problems. The ultimate beneficiaries of this training are students in grades 7 through 12; the training is provided by the regional centers. The remaining program funds support a contractor that maintains a national data base and provides program support. This contractor collects and analyzes evaluation data from subcontractors.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The Department's principal objectives for FY 1986 were as follows:

- To manage the contractors who provide for training teams of school administrators, teachers, counselors, parents, students, law enforcement officials, and other public service and community leaders to prevent or reduce destructive behavior associated with alcohol and drug abuse;

- To evaluate the results of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program; and
- To provide technical assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies and individuals.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- In FY 1986, 140 new school teams were trained; 478 additional teams received technical assistance, as did all 50 State education agencies.
- The National Data Base and Program Support Project contracted for an analysis and summary of reported school team survey results on the effects of alcohol and drug abuse education activities.
- The Department sponsored a meeting for contract staff to review ongoing activities and to set FY 1986 performance goals.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program (ADAEP) has established teams of school and community personnel supported with training and followup assistance in every State and Territory. Now in its 14th year, the program has trained more than 5,000 teams throughout the country. Currently 619 teams are served by the national system of regional centers. According to progress reports from 431 of those teams (E.1), 828 subteams have been generated. Parent subteams accounted for 194 of these, student subteams for 480, and community subteams for 154. The 431 reporting teams are working in 619 schools, which enroll 680,000 students.

Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education requires and stimulates a great deal of volunteer effort; in FY 1986, volunteers contributed approximately 330,000 hours to team activities (E.1). Private funding for team activities exceeded $275,000; when time volunteered is added, the total value of private contributions for FY 1986 was reported to approach $2.5 million.

Program Effectiveness: A contractor for the ADAEP National Data Base and Program Support Project analyzed the results of school team survey data from teams trained in the fall of 1982 and 1983. Approximately 40 percent of the 136 teams trained in 1982 and of the 145 teams trained in 1983 submitted survey data results in 1985. Outcome measures include reported changes in the number of students using a particular category of drug and the number of days per month students used a particular drug.

On the basis of returns reported by 47 schools, by the end of the third year, the study reported a statistically significant reductions in 4 out of 10 outcome measures: number of days of use per month of tobacco (-20%), alcohol (-18%), and marijuana (-20%), as well as number of students using marijuana (-20%).

D. Highlights of Activities

More emphasis is being placed on developing parent action teams and student action teams in the program.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. National Data Base Summary Sheet, National Data Base and Support Project, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass., September 1986.

2. Evaluation of the U.S. Department of Education Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program, Ralph B. Earle, Jr., December 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program is requiring all subcontractors to design and implement their own evaluations and to provide the evaluation data to the National Data Base and Program Support Project. In addition, a U.S. Department of Education contractor will prepare a descriptive analysis of the program during FY 1987. This analysis will describe center services and operations, and contain information concerning the effectiveness of center activities, based on interviews with selected school personnel from participating districts.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Myles Doherty, (202) 732-4336

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Note

1. This program is one of several activities authorized by ECIA, Chapter 2, Subchapter D (the Secretary's Discretionary Fund). The maximum amount authorized for Subchapter D is 6 percent of the total amount appropriated for Chapter 2. Subchapter D also establishes a minimum level for the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program of $2,850,000.

WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL EQUITY
(CFDA 84.083)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA) of 1974 (Title IX, Part C of ESEA 1965), as amended (20 U.S.C. 3341-3348) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$ 6,000,000	$5,760,000
1983	6,000,000	5,760,000
1984	6,000,000	5,760,000
1985	10,000,000	6,000,000
1986	12,000,000	5,740,838

Purpose: To promote educational equity for women and girls in the United States and to provide Federal funds to help educational agencies and institutions meet the requirements of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

Program Strategies: The legislation authorizes two programs of contracts and grants. The first is a program to demonstrate, develop, and disseminate activities of national, State, or general significance. In selecting activities to fund, the Department tries to ensure geographic diversity and to avoid supporting previously funded ideas. The second is a program to assist projects of local significance, including support for programs to achieve compliance with Title IX. The 1984 amendments authorize the use of funds in excess of $6 million for activities under either or both programs.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- o Thirty percent of the grants focused on Title IX compliance and 70 percent other authorized activities.
- o To produce and market approved model products and strategies through the WEEA Publishing Center, as authorized in Section 932(a)(1) of the Act.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Sixty-five new grant awards were made as follows: (1) Projects on Title IX Compliance, 19; other activities, 46.
- The WEEA Publishing Center conducted three technical assistance workshops on product development and marketing for the FY 1985 WEEA grantees. The workshops took place in Minneapolis, Los Angeles, and Washington, D.C.

C. Costs and Benefits

In 1984, the average cost to the Federal Government for each item (a textbook, an instructional guide, a film) sold to the public was $50. The average charge to the consumer was $7. (See E.1.)

Program Effectiveness: Although a study conducted by Allied Systems Institute--A Descriptive Analysis of the Women's Educational Equity Program reports that WEEA projects address the purpose listed in the Act, many projects are addressing local issues rather than national or State concerns and have been doing so since 1981. Many projects focus on a few persons or an a particular institution, and evaluation evidence needed to justify national dissemination is generally lacking. The study suggests that new types of projects are not showing up in the general priority areas. Other Federal programs also address the same concerns funded in these areas. (E.1.)

The study indicates that Evaluation and dissemination of products from the WEEA projects--major activities for the program, given its purpose--have been uneven, the study indicates. Many of the projects have not been rigorously evaluated, and the review criteria for products proposed for national dissemination have not included a strong requirement for documentation of effectiveness.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. A Descriptive Analysis of the Women's Educational Equity Program. Applied Systems Institute, October 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No new studies of the Act are currently planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Janice Williams-Madison, (202) 245-2465

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

MIGRANT EDUCATION
HIGH SCHOOL EQUIVALENCY PROGRAM (HEP)
AND COLLEGE ASSISTANCE MIGRANT PROGRAM (CAMP)
(CFDA Nos. 84.141 and 84.149)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Section 418A, P.L. 89-329, as amended by P.L. 99-498, (20 U.S.C. 1070d-2) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation	
	(Both Programs)	HEP	CAMP
1982	$7,500,000	$5,851,200	$1,159,680
1983	7,500,000	6,300,000	1,200,000
1984	8,250,000	6,300,000	1,950,000 1/
1985	7,500,000	6,300,000	1,200,000
1986	7,500,000	6,029,000	1,148,000

Purpose: HEP and CAMP help students who are engaged, or whose families are engaged, in migrant or other seasonal farm work. Grants for both HEP and CAMP are made to institutions of higher education (IHEs) or to other public or nonprofit private agencies that cooperate with such an institution.

HEP helps students to obtain the equivalent of a secondary school diploma and subsequently to gain employment or to begin postsecondary education or training. HEP provides outreach, teaching, counseling, and placement services in order to recruit and serve eligible migrant and seasonal farm worker dropouts who are beyond the age of compulsory school attendance. HEP participants may receive room and board and stipends for their personal expenses. Most are housed on a college or university campus and may use the cultural, recreational, health, and other campus facilities.

CAMP helps students enrolled in the first undergraduate year at an institution of higher education to pursue successfully a program of postsecondary education. The services CAMP provides include tutoring, counseling, and assisting students to obtain grants, loans, and work-study funds to be used for the remaining three undergraduate school years. CAMP participants may receive tuition, room and board, and stipends for personal expenses.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objective for this program was to make grant awards for the 1986-87 school year.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The Department awarded 20 HEP grants to institutions of higher education and associated public or nonprofit, private agencies located in 15 States and Puerto Rico; it awarded five CAMP grants to IHEs in three States (Idaho, California, and Washington).

C. Costs and Benefits

HEP Program Scope: The 20 HEP projects for school year 1986-87 are serving approximately 2,700 students. Project enrollments range between 80 and 260. Funding for the HEP projects totaled $6,029,000. The average cost per per participant in HEP was $2,233.

CAMP Program Scope: A total of 370 students were served through the 1986-87 CAMP programs; enrollment in the five funded projects ranged from 40 to 100. The total funding for five CAMP projects was $1,148,000. The average cost per CAMP participant was $3,103.

Program Effectiveness: During 1985-86, California State University at Fresno conducted an evaluation of HEP and CAMP. The study, under the Department's Interstate and Intrastate Coordination grants, provides summary information on the economic and social impact of HEP and CAMP on a multiyear sample of participants in both programs. The study reports that 84.6 percent of HEP participants enrolled between 1980 and 1984 have received the equivalent of a secondary school diploma. A total of 92.4 percent of CAMP participants served between 1980 and 1984 have completed their first year of college, and 67 percent have continued their education beyond the first collegiate year. Fifty-five percent of the 1980 CAMP participants have received degrees from four-year institutions. (E.3)

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project, Research Report No. 1: A National Overview of Staff and Program Characteristics, 1984-85. California State University, Fresno, California, n.d.

2. HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project, Research Report No. 2: Overview of Student Characteristics and Program Outcomes. California State University, Fresno, California, September 1985.

3. HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project, Research Report No. 3: A Comprehensive Analysis of HEP/CAMP Program Participation. California State University: Fresno, California, October 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No new studies of HEP/CAMP are ongoing or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: John Staehle, (202) 245-2722

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Note

1. Includes a $750,000 supplemental appropriation for CAMP.

ARTS IN EDUCATION PROGRAM
(No CFDA Number)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), Chapter 2, P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 3851) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$3,150,000	$2,025,000
1983	1/	2,025,000
1984	1/	2,125,000
1985	1/	3,157,000
1986	1/	3,157,000

Purpose: To conduct demonstration programs regarding the involvement of handicapped people in all the arts; to foster greater awareness of the need for arts programs for the handicapped; to sponsor model programs in the performing arts for children and youth; and to support a national network of State arts and education committees.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

The Department's principal objective for FY 1986 was to award noncompetitive grants in a timely manner to the National Committee, Arts for the Handicapped, and to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The Department made both awards as scheduled.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Program records (E.1) show that in FY 1985 the National Committee, Arts for the Handicapped (NCAH), supported 450 Very Special Arts Festivals.

In FY 1985 the program at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts helped support the following:

- The American College Theater Festival (ACTF);
- The Alliance for Arts Education (AAE); and
- Programs for Children and Youth (PCY).

These programs reached approximately 4 million students, parents, and teachers through workshops, seminars, and performances, including 21 Imagination Celebrations.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

D. Highlights of Activities

In 1985, approximately 12,000 students and 2,000 faculty members from 400 schools participated in the ACTF program. A record 572 college theater productions were entered and evaluated at local levels, and approximately 60 were selected for national festivals. Six performed at a national noncompetitive showcase at the Kennedy Center. ACTF also cosponsored a program bringing theater professionals together with student theater artists.

The AAE awarded eight summer fellowships for Teachers of the Arts. Recognition awards were given to 32 exemplary school principals and superintendents for their outstanding efforts in fostering the arts in their schools and districts. Twenty outstanding high school seniors representing the arts were brought to Washington for a week of activities, including a reception by the President and Mrs. Reagan at the White House and the students' performance in the Kennedy Center Concert Hall.

PCY presented approximately 200 free performances and related events at the Kennedy Center to audiences of more than 60,000. Three new works were commissioned in 1985.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Annual Performance Reports, Program Files, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Ann Mack, (202) 245-2465

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Note

1. This program is one of several activities authorized by ECIA, Chapter 2, Subchapter D. The maximum amount authorized for Subchapter D is 6 percent of the amount appropriated for Chapter 2. Subchapter D also establishes a minimum level for the Arts in Education program of $2,025,000.

INEXPENSIVE BOOK DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM
(No CFDA Number)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Section 583 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), Chapter 2, Subchapter D, P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 3851), (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	1/	$5,850,000
1983	1/	5,850,000
1984	1/	6,500,000
1985	1/	7,000,000
1986	1/	6,698,000

Purpose: To support the distribution of inexpensive books to students from preschool through high school age in order to encourage these students to learn to read.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

The Department's principal objective for FY 1986 was to award the contract to Reading is Fundamental (RIF), Inc., in a timely manner.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The Department awarded the contract to RIF, Inc., as scheduled.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1986 more than 2.2 million children were provided nearly 7.1 million books by 3,078 local projects. (E.1)

Program Effectiveness: According to reports from local projects (E.1), teachers and parents have observed that children have greater interest in and spend more time reading. Some also report increased use of school and public libraries by participating children.

D. Highlights of Activities

RIF held an "In Celebration of Reading Program" to encourage children to read for pleasure. More than a million children and their parents participated. At the end of the 2-week program, the children had cumulatively spent the equivalent of 285 years in reading.

All projects held special activities during Reading Is Fun Week. In a special ceremony in Washington, D.C., a student was selected randomly as the National RIF Reader from a pool of student reader applicants submitted by schools around the country.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Annual Reports of RIF, Inc., Program Files, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Carrolyn Andrews, (202) 472-7080

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Notes

1. This program is one of several activities authorized by ECIA, Chapter 2, Section 583, Subchapter D. The maximum amount authorized for Section 583 is 6 percent of the amount appropriated for Chapter 2.

LAW-RELATED EDUCATION
(CFDA No. 84.123)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), Chapter 2, Section 583, P.L. 97-35, as amended by P.L. 98-312 (20 U.S.C. 3851) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1983

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1983	1/	$1,000,000
1984	1/	1,000,000
1985	1/	2,000,000
1986	1/	1,914,000

Purpose: To enable nonlawyers, including children, youth, and adults, to become better informed concerning the law, the legal process, the legal system, and the fundamental principles on which these are based.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's objectives for this program were as follows:

- To support projects that develop, test, demonstrate, and disseminate new approaches or techniques in law-related education that can be used or adapted by other agencies and institutions;
- To. support the establishment of existing model law-related education programs in elementary and secondary education programs;
- To invite projects that would develop curriculums that emphasize the fundamental principles on which the legal system is based and foster student character development;
- To invite projects that provide elementary and secondary school teachers and administrators with law-related education, including education about the legal principles that affect the maintenance of safe and orderly schools; and
- To invite projects that propose activities on the Constitution, its origin and development, and the fundamental role of the Constitution in our legal system over the past two centuries.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1986 $1,914,000 supported 26 law-related education projects, including the following:

- Two national projects. The first project includes a teacher institute to develop new curriculums on the Constitution and a series of training seminars to prepare a cadre of teachers as trainers. This project develops instructional materials reaching 765,000 elementary and secondary school students. The second project is a comprehensive national program that provides workshops, materials development, technical assistance and dissemination activities. It is designed to institutionalize law education through the activities of 36 school-bar association partnerships.
- Thirteen statewide projects were funded along with one regional and ten local projects.
- Thirteen projects were designed to promote the bicentennial of the Constitution.
- Ten projects have activities specifically designed to address student rights and responsibilities.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Many changes have taken place in law-related education since this program was first funded in FY 1980 (E.1). At that time, a grant supported one or two schools within a local education agency. Now, a grant can serve an entire State through an emphasis on forming partnerships. A substantial amount of in-kind support is contributed, particularly through volunteer professionals in the private sector. The national program has a network of 21 bar associations across the Nation.

Law-related education uses a variety of learning approaches, such as mock trials with volunteer trial judges presiding for high school students and discussions about legal issues appearing in "Goldilocks and the Three Bears" for first graders. Law-related education covers a wide range of subjects such as fundamental legal principles and the values on which they are based; the Bill of Rights and other constitutional law; the role and limits of law in a democratic society both past and present; the Federal, State, and local lawmaking process; the role of law in avoiding and resolving conflicts; the administration of the criminal, civil, and juvenile justice systems; and issues of authority, freedom, enforcement, and punishment.

Program Effectiveness: A 3-year research study on the impact of law-related education activities on students was completed in 1984 (E.2). It was the second national study of the effectiveness of law-related education activities and was sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice, with partial support from the Education Department. The study, published in 1984, confirmed previous findings that law-related education, when taught according to specific, identifiable standards, can serve as a significant deterrent to delinquent behavior.

Based on self-reports, for students participating in law-related education, rates dropped for offenses ranging from truancy and cheating on tests to smoking marijuana and acts usually classified as felonies. These students also showed improvement in many factors associated with law-abiding behavior, including favorable attitudes toward school and the police and avoidance of delinquent friends.

D. Highlights of Activities

- An analysis of law-related education funding (FY 1980 through 1985) continues to show increased support for projects of larger scale and greater involvement in proposed activities by the private sector.
- The law-related education network of projects will serve as one resource in the planning of several regional forums for the Secretary's initiative on Correctional Education.
- A new simplified performance report was developed and submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for approval.
- Eighty-seven percent of the applications for FY 1986 included one or more of the Secretary's invitational priorities (building student character, helping teachers and administrators understand their legal rights and responsibilities, and activities to support the bicentennial of the Constitution).

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
2. "Law-Related Education Evaluation Project Final Report, Phase II, Year 3," Social Science Education Consortium and Center for Action Research, Boulder, Colorado, June 1984.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress. Research on law-related education is being carried out at the University of Colorado but is not supported by this program.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Jack Simms, (202) 472-7960

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Note

1. This program is one of several activities authorized by ECIA Chapter 2, Subchapter D. The maximum amount authorized for Subchapter D is 6 percent of the amount appropriated for Chapter 2. Subchapter D also establishes a minimum level for the Law-Related Education Program of $1 million.

MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE STATE GRANTS PROGRAM
(CFDA 84.164)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education for Economic Security Act, Title II, P.L. 98-377, as amended, (20 U.S.C. 3961 *et seq.*) (expires September 30, 1988).

Funding Since 1984

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation 1/
1984	$315,350,000	0
1985	360,400,000	$ 90,100,000
1986	364,000,000	39,182,000

Purpose: To make financial assistance available to States, Territories, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs to improve teachers' skills and instruction in mathematics, science, computer learning, and foreign languages and to increase the access of all students to such instruction. This assistance includes funds for elementary and secondary education programs and higher education programs.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To provide technical assistance to State Title II coordinators about program administration,
- To receive and approve properly completed State assessments of need and amendments to State applications and issue grant awards, and
- To monitor programs to ensure compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department published final regulations to implement the technical amendments to the Act in May 1986.
- The Department sponsored a national Title II meeting (December 1985) to provide State coordinators with information regarding the ramifications of the technical amendments to the legislation, the draft nonregulatory guidance, the Title II State assessment of need and application amendment requirements, and program progress and issues related to the program.

- The Department approved State assessments of need and State amendments to applications from all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. In addition, 1 percent of the overall allocation was divided between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Insular Areas. The Bureau of Indian Affairs submitted its application, which was approved; the Insular Areas included their allocations in their consolidated grant applications.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The 106 grant awards ranged from $3,799,325 for California to $193,758 for each of 14 States that received the statutory minimum. Within States, 70 percent of funds were used for elementary and secondary education and 30 percent for higher education. In both cases, the responsible State agency provided technical assistance and administration.

Program Effectiveness: A nine-state study was conducted to review first-year operations of the Title II program. Findings included the following:

- Title II was being used to help implement new education reform programs such as new science syllabuses, essential skills programs in math and science, and new teacher certification requirements.

- The entitlement portion of Title II was used primarily for in-service training and retraining.

- Higher education funds were used primarily to upgrade teacher skills through in-service training, summer institutes, and week-long workshops.

- Title II did not provide extensive support for alternative certification.

A separate telephone survey of States indicated a high level of satisfaction with the program's contribution to efforts to improve mathematics and science education. Ranking highest among positive outcomes were cooperative efforts between elementary-secondary and postsecondary education among multiple school systems in a particular region. A national workshop to share first-year program successes is planned for December 1986.

D. Highlights of Activities

The program issued final technical amendments to the regulations. In addition, the program has cooperated in the development and nationwide utilization of a model State needs assessment instrument, which is being coordinated by the Council of Chief State School Officers with the support of the National Science Foundation. This effort will result in a profile of the condition of education in mathematics, science, computer education, and foreign languages. A successful national workshop for State Title II coordinators focused on sharing ways to strengthen programs. A directory of key State and national contact persons for Title II programs was published and distributed to State offices. It has been updated quarterly. A nonregulatory guidance document is in preparation. A report to the Congress synthesizing and summarizing the State assessments of need is also being prepared.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Title II of the Education for Economic Security Act: An Analysis of First-Year Operations, prepared by Policy Studies Associates, Inc., for the Planning and Evaluation Service, U.S. Department of Education, Contract No. 300-85-0103, October 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

Case studies of local education agencies' implementation of Title II are being considered.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Allen Schmieder, (202) 732-4338

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Note

1. The authorization and appropriation amounts exclude the Secretary's Title II discretionary fund.

MAGNET SCHOOLS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.165)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education for Economic Security Act of 1984, Title VII, P.L. 98-377 as amended (20 U.S.C. 4051-4062) (expires September 30, 1988).

Funding Since 1984

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1984	$75,000,000	0
1985	75,000,000	$75,000,000
1986	75,000,000	71,760,000

Purposes: To provide financial assistance to eligible local education agencies (LEAs) to support (1) the elimination, reduction, or prevention of minority group isolation in elementary and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority students; and (2) courses of instruction within magnet schools that will substantially strengthen the knowledge of academic subjects and marketable vocational skills of students attending these schools.

Grants are awarded to eligible LEAs for use in magnet schools that are part of an approved desegregation plan and that are designed to bring together students from different social, economic, ethnic, and racial backgrounds. In considering LEA applications, the Department gives special attention to how recently the LEA has implemented the approved desegregation plan; the proportion of minority-group children involved in the approved desegregation plan; the LEA's need for assistance; and the degree to which the program affords promise of achieving the purposes of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program. The maximum amount of funds any LEA could receive for fiscal year 1986 was $4 million.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

Magnet Schools Assistance Program funds are used by LEAs for (1) planning and promotional activities directly related to expansion and enhancement of academic programs and services offered at magnet schools; (2) purchasing books, materials and equipment (including computers) and paying for the maintenance and operation of such equipment for carrying out magnet school programs; and (3) providing payment for elementary and secondary school teachers in magnet schools.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1986, 44 continuation awards were made in 21 States. Award amounts ranged from $205,000 to $3,828,000. Twelve LEAs received at least $3 million each.

C. Costs and Benefits

Since the Magnet Schools Assistance grants were awarded for the first time in FY 1985, no information is available on the effectiveness of the program.

D. and E.

No information.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS [Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: M. Patricia Goins, (202) 472-7960

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

OFFICE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND MINORITY LANGUAGES AFFAIRS

BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS--
DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES--PART A
(CFDA No. 84.003)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Part A of The Bilingual Education Act of 1984, Title II of the Education Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-511, (20 U.S.C. 3221-3262) (expires September 30, 1988).

Funding Since 1982 1/

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$139,970,000	$79,223,000
1983	139,970,000	84,126,000
1984	139,970,000	89,567,000
1985	176,000,000	95,098,000
1986	Indefinite	91,010,000

Purpose: To financially assist local education agencies (LEAs) and other eligible grantees in the development and support of educational instructional programs for limited English proficient (LEP) students; and to provide funding for research, development, training, and technical assistance activities that enhance the delivery of instructional services to such students.

Program Components: The Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs administers Bilingual Education Act programs. This chapter describes programs that provide discretionary grants to LEAs and, in some cases, to other eligible applicants. These grants are designed to assist recipients to develop and conduct programs for LEP students:

1. Transitional Bilingual Education. A program of structured English-language instruction and, to the extent necessary to allow a child to achieve competence in English, instruction in the native language of the child, incorporating the cultural heritage of the child and other children in American society. Such instruction must, to the extent necessary, be in all courses or subjects of study that will allow a child to meet grade promotion and graduation requirements.

2. Developmental Bilingual Education. A full-time program of structured English-language instruction and instruction in a non-English language designed to help children achieve competence both in English and a second language while mastering subject-matter skills. The instruction must be, to the extent necessary, in all courses or subjects of study that will allow a child to meet grade promotion and graduation requirements. Where possible, classes must be composed of approximately equal numbers of students whose native language is English and LEP students whose native language is the second language of instruction and study in the program.

3. Special Alternative Instruction. A program designed to provide structured English-language instruction and special instructional services that will allow a child to achieve competence in the English language and to meet grade promotion and graduation standards. These programs are neither transitional nor developmental but have specially designed curriculums and are appropriate for the particular linguistic and instructional needs of the children enrolled. Funding for this program is limited to 4 percent of the first $140 million appropriated and to 50 percent of appropriations over $140 million subject to a maximum of 10 percent of the appropriated funds.

4. Family English Literacy. A program of instruction to help LEP adults and out-of-school youths achieve competence in English; the subject matter may be taught either entirely in English or bilingually. Preference for participation must be given to parents and immediate family members of students enrolled in other programs assisted under the Act.

5. Academic Excellence. A program to facilitate the dissemination of effective bilingual practices of transitional or developmental bilingual education or special alternative instruction programs that have an established record of providing effective, academically excellent instruction and are designed to serve as models of exemplary programs.

6. Special Populations. Programs of instruction for LEP students in preschool, special education, and gifted and talented programs, which are preparatory or supplementary to programs such as those assisted under the Act.

7. Program for the Development of Instructional Materials. This program provides assistance for the development of instructional materials in languages for which such material is commercially unavailable.

Eligibility

Applicant Eligibility: For Transitional, Developmental, Special Alternative, and Academic Excellence programs, LEAs or institutions of higher education (IHEs) applying jointly with LEAs are eligible. For Family English Literacy and Special Populations programs LEAs, IHEs, or private, nonprofit organizations are eligible.

For programs for the Development of Instructional Materials SEAs, LEAs, IHEs, public and private for-profit and nonprofit organizations, and individuals are eligible.

Beneficiary Eligibility: Students who have limited proficiency in understanding, speaking, reading, and writing English; students whose native language is English may constitute up to 40 percent of the students in transitional bilingual education programs and up to 50 percent in developmental bilingual education programs. Students in both public and nonprofit, private elementary and secondary schools may receive services.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS [Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- To prepare program regulations to implement the Bilingual Education Act of 1984,
- To disseminate current information on the status of Bilingual Education,
- To increase the capacity of LEAs to continue instructional programs for LEP students when Federal funding ends, and
- To encourage LEAs to plan, develop, and implement flexible and imaginative educational approaches in order to best serve their LEP student populations.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department published final program regulations on June 19, 1986.
- The Department issued The Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation, 1986.
- The Department funded capacity-building activities by grantees including inservice and preservice training for educational personnel; teacher training and research and development efforts in curriculum and instructional materials; and implementation of instructional programs with State and local funds.
- The Department submitted legislation to Congress to encourage the use of creative instructional approaches by LEAs by removing restrictions on the amount of funds available for special alternative instructional programs.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: FY 1986 funds supported 614 Part A awards representing a total cost of $89,199,943. The distribution among program components is presented in the table:

Program Components	New Projects	Continuations	Total Funds
Transitional Bilingual Education	107	415	$76,311,907
Developmental Bilingual Education	---	2	225,754
Special Alternative Instruction	---	35	4,721,850
Family English Literacy	16	4	2,595,165
Academic Excellence	---	12	2,154,667
Special Populations	21	---	3,006,304
Development of Instructional Materials	2	---	181,604
TOTAL	146	468	89,199,943

Language Proficiency of LEP Students. The Year 1 report of the national longitudinal study of services for language-minority/LEP (E.1) students contains student test data on language proficiency. In the first of year of the study, 4,110 students in the first grade and 3,081 students in the third grade were given oral language tests in both English and the native language. Among the more significant findings were these:

- Although most LEP students were rated proficient in their native language, a high percentage were also deemed fluent English speakers (29 percent of first graders and 43 percent of third graders).
- English oral language proficiency improved the longer the student had lived in the United States, while native language proficiency showed only a slight decline.
- Oral language proficiency in English was only slightly correlated with performance on an English-language standardized achievement test. Whether this result stems from the dissimilarity of oral and written language skills or the properties of the oral test is not clear.
- Oral proficiency in the native-language related slightly to achievement in English reading.

Academic Growth in LEP Students. From fall to spring, third-grade LEP students experienced a gain in percentile scores. English vocabulary increased from the 7th to the 14th percentile; reading comprehension from the 15th to the 21st; and, math scores, from the 30th to 35th. These students are enrolled in a variety of special programs for LEP students and these increases cannot be taken as evidence of the effectiveness of any particular approach. Instead, they indicate that, when taken together, America's schools seem to be improving the performance of LEP students. Future analysis of the data in this study will examine the question of what approaches appear most effective (See E.1).

Children in Need of Services. On the basis of a recent study (E.2), the Department currently estimates that there are between 1.2 and 1.7 million students who could most benefit from bilingual education. The reduction from the previous estimate of 2.4 million students is a consequence of a more precise definition of dependence on a non-English language; namely, that students scoring below the 20th percentile on an English skills test, compared to the performance of native English speakers of the same age, are deemed to be students who are unable to successfully participate in standard instruction in English. The earlier, larger estimate resulted from test performance below the 43rd percentile.

Program Effectiveness: The relative effectiveness of various education programs for LEP students continues to be addressed in education research. A 1983 Department of Education study (E.3), which reviewed the findings of 39 earlier studies, found that Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) programs could be effective. A new study (E.4), which reviewed 16 studies of TBE programs, reports a net positive effect for TBE. Furthermore, the results of evaluations of structured immersion programs for LEP students in several school districts showed program effectiveness in terms of immediate and longitudinal achievement gains in reading and mathematics (E.5 and E.6). The combined findings suggest that a number of different instructional strategies for educating language minority children can be effective.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "Instructing Children With Limited English Ability: Year One Report of the National Longitudinal Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Services for Language-Minority Limited-English-Proficient Students" Development Associates, Arlington, Va., 1986.

2. The Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation 1986 U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., 1986.

3. "Federal policy and the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education" In Baker, K., and de Kanter, A., eds. Bilingual Education: A Reappraisal of Federal Policy, Lexington, Mass., 1983.

4. Willig, A.C. "A Meta-Analysis of Selected Studies on the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education", Review of Educational Research, 55 (1985): 269-317.

5. Gersten, R. "Structured Immersion for Language Minority Students: Results of a Longitudinal Evaluation" Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7 (1985): 187-196.

6. Gersten, R., and Woodward, J. "A Case for Structured Immersion" Educational Leadership, (September 1985): 75-79.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

Development Associates issued the Descriptive Phase Report and Year One Report of its National Longitudinal Evaluation.

SRA Technologies, Incorporated, is conducting a longitudinal study of immersion and dual language instructional programs.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Anna Maria Farias, (202) 245-2600--Transitional Bilingual Education, Special Alternative Instructional Programs, and Developmental Bilingual Education Programs.

Rudy Munis, (202) 245-2595--Academic Excellence, Special Populations, Family English Literacy Programs, and Development of Instructional Materials

Edward Fuentes, (202) 245-2600--Research and Evaluation.

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Note

1. The authorization and appropriation figures include funding for the entire Bilingual Education Act, including the programs described in Chapters 202 and 203 of this report.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS--DATA COLLECTION, EVALUATION, AND RESEARCH--PART B
(CFDA NO. 84.003)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Part B of the Bilingual Education Act of 1984, Title II of the Education Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-511, (20 U.S.C. 3221-3262) (expires September 30, 1988).

Funding Since 1982 1/

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$139,970,000	$18,957,000
1983	139,970,000	16,557,000
1984	139,970,000	13,502,000
1985	176,000,000	10,600,000
1986	Indefinite	10,151,000

Purpose: To develop curriculum resources, technical assistance, instructional materials, demographic data, evaluation procedures and research that enhance the ability of educational agencies to develop and conduct instructional programs for students with limited English proficiency (LEP).

Program Components

1. State Programs provide assistance to State education agencies (SEAs) to collect, analyze, and report the population of LEP persons and the educational services provided or available to them. The programs further provide assistance for additional services in support of bilingual education funded under the Bilingual Education Act.

2. Evaluation Assistance Centers provide technical assistance to SEAs or local education agencies (LEAs) for assessing the educational progress achieved through programs such as those assisted under the Act and the techniques for identifying the educational needs and competencies of LEP students.

3. National Clearinghouse on Bilingual Education collects, analyzes, and disseminates information on bilingual education and related programs.

4. The Research Program authorizes the following activities:

- o Studies to determine and evaluate effective models for bilingual education programs;
- o Research to examine the process by which students learn a second language and master the subject-matter skills required for grade promotion and graduation, and to identify effective methods for teaching English and subject matter skills within the context of a bilingual education program or special alternative instructional program to students who have language proficiencies other than English;

- o Longitudinal studies to measure the effect of the program on the education of students who have language proficiencies other than English, and the capacity of LEAs to operate bilingual programs when Federal assistance under the Act ends;
- o Studies to determine effective and reliable methods for identifying students who are entitled to services and to determine the point at which their English-language proficiency is sufficiently well developed to permit them to derive optimal benefits from an all-English instructional program;
- o Studies to determine effective methods of teaching English to adults who have language proficiencies other than English;
- o Studies to determine and evaluate effective methods of instruction for bilingual programs, taking into account language and cultural differences among students; and
- o Studies to determine effective approaches to preservice and inservice training for teachers, taking into account the language and cultural differences of their students.

Eligibility

1. State Programs. Only SEAs are eligible for assistance.

2. Evaluation Assistance Centers. Only institutions of higher education are eligible for funding.

3. Research and Development Program. Awards under this program are made on a competitive basis. Eligible applicants include institutions of higher education; private for-profit and nonprofit organizations; SEAs; LEAs; and individuals.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- o To review applications for State Programs grants and to issue grant awards by the end of the fiscal year,
- o To award contracts for two Evaluation Assistance Centers, and
- o To award a contract for the National Clearinghouse on Bilingual Education.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o The Department reviewed State applications and issued grant awards by September 30, 1986, to all States that wished to participate in the 1986-87 program year.

- The Department, through a competitive procurement process, contracted for two Evaluation Assistance Centers, to serve the eastern and western geographic regions.

- The Department, through a competitive procurement process, contracted for the operation of the National Clearinghouse on Bilingual Education.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope

Program Components	Number of Awards	Amount
State Programs	46	$4,688,576
Evaluation Assistance Centers	2	500,000
National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education	1	947,561
Research	13	3,500,000
TOTAL	62	9,636,137

Program Effectiveness

No new information. See FY 1984 AER for the latest information.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS [Response to GEPA 417(b)]

COMSIS Corporation received a second year of funding to operate a Special Issues Analysis Center in January 1986. The objectives of the Special Issues Analysis Center are to review and synthesize information on Title VII applicants and grantees.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Rudy Munis, (202) 245-2609--
State Education Agency Program

Edward Fuentes, (202) 245-2600--
Research and Evaluation

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Note

1. The authorization figures include funding for the entire Bilingual Education Act, including the programs described in Chapters 201 and 203 of this report.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS--TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE--PART C
(CFDA No. 84.003)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Part C of The Bilingual Education Act of 1984, Title II of the Education Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-511 (20 U.S.C. 3221-3262) (expires September 30, 1988).

Funding Since 1982 1/

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$139,970,000	$28,836,000
1983	139,970,000	31,288,000
1984	139,970,000	32,610,000
1985	176,000,000	33,566,000
1986	Indefinite	32,123,000

Purpose: To develop the human resources necessary to develop and conduct instructional programs for limited English proficient (LEP) students.

Program Components

1. Educational Personnel Training Program. This program provides financial assistance to establish, operate, or improve programs to train teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals to work in programs for LEP persons. These programs may provide training for parents and educational personnel and must emphasize opportunities for career development, advancement, and lateral mobility.

2. Fellowships. The program provides fellowships for graduate study in teaching, training, administration, research and evaluation, and curriculum development in programs for LEP persons. Repayment is waived through work in an area related to the purposes of the Bilingual Education Act.

3. Training Development and Improvement Program. This program provides financial assistance to institutions of higher education to encourage reform, innovation, and improvement in higher education programs related to programs for LEP persons.

4. Short-term Training Program. This program provides financial assistance to establish and operate projects to improve the skills of educational personnel and parents participating in programs for LEP persons.

5. Multifunctional Resource Centers. These centers provide inservice training and technical assistance to educational personnel and parents participating in, or preparing to participate in, programs for LEP persons.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

- To strengthen the capacity of State and local education agencies (SEAs and LEAs) to conduct and maintain instructional programs for LEP students by developing a solid core of trained educators.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- In FY 1986, grants and contracts were made to train current and future teachers, other educational personnel, and parents.

C. Costs and Benefits

FY 1986 funds supported projects in all five program components. The number of projects and their funding levels are shown in the table:

Program Component	Number of Projects	Total Funding
Educational Personnel Training	136	$18,793,750
Fellowships	31	2,892,704
Training Development and Improvement	8	164,467
Short-term Training	20	1,933,634
Multifunctional Resource Centers	16	6,800,000
TOTAL	211	20,584,545

Fellowships. A total of 514 fellowships were awarded, 40 to master's candidates and 474 to doctoral candidates. These students attended a total of 37 institutions of higher education located in 19 States. The fellowship recipients studied 16 approved languages, including a number of Asian and American Indian languages.

Program Effectiveness. A study of inservice training programs for LEAs serving minority-language/LEP students was completed by the Arawak Consulting Corporation in August 1986 (E.1). Products of the study include (1) a report describing various approaches toward inservice training identified during field work in nine LEAs, and (2) a manual for educators responsible for planning inservice staff development programs, which was prepared following a field test of the training methods in a second set of nine LEAs.

Five district inservice modes are described. They differ from one another in terms of the affiliation of the trainer (in-house staff or outside consultant) and the training method (classroom visits, workshops/meetings, college courses). Accompanying the description of each of the training alternatives is a description of the types of LEAs in which these alternatives could be implemented.

The manual is designed to assist persons responsible for inservice training. It discusses the steps for planning and implementing training systematically and practically. The manual also includes a set of worksheets to be used to assess training needs and to plan training.

A descriptive analysis of the 16 Bilingual Education Multifunctional Support Centers (BEMSCs), conducted by Pelavin Associates, was completed in October 1986 (E.2). The study, which examined each center's organization, staffing, operations, level of service, and service clientele, reported the following findings:

- Most BEMSCs are operated by institutions of higher education (13 of 16) and have similar staffing patterns. Staffing usually includes a director, a second administrator, and a cadre of technical staff who provide technical assistance.

- BEMSCs focus their work almost exclusively on training and technical assistance services. Training accounts for 54 percent of service hours and technical assistance accounts for the remaining 46 percent.

- BEMSCs have been generally successful in providing training and technical assistance to a large number of clients, serving more than 80,000 clients in FY 1985. Individual BEMSCs varied greatly in their emphasis on training or technical assistance, in terms of both hours spent and number of clients served.

- BEMSCs have provided training and technical assistance services in a cost-efficient manner. Their average costs per hour of on-site training and technical assistance ($368) and per client served ($113) compare favorably with those of the Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Centers ($538 per hour and $117 per client). The disparity in the average costs per hour may be due to transportation costs or the salary levels of staff providing training. However, further cost effectiveness could be achieved through a reallocation of staff time. Administrative or research-oriented activities could be reduced to increase training and technical assistance activities. Closer monitoring by staff of the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs could also result in greater training and technical assistance efforts.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "A Study of Alternative Inservice Staff Development Approaches for Local Education Agencies Serving Minority Language/Limited English Proficient Students" Arawak Consulting Corporation, Arlington, Va. August 1986.

2. "Review of the Bilingual Education Multifunctional Support Centers" Pelavin Associates, Washington, D.C., October 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A major evaluation of the training programs will be initiated in FY 1987.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Rudy Munis, (202) 245-2595

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Note

1. The authorization figures include funding for the entire Bilingual Education Act, including the programs described in Chapters 201 and 202 of this report.

TRANSITION PROGRAM FOR REFUGEE CHILDREN--FORMULA GRANTS TO STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES (CFDA No. 84.146) 1/

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Refugee Act of 1980, Section 412, P.L. 96-212, (8 U.S.C. 1522), Refugee Assistance Amendments of 1982, P.L. 97-363, (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 1/
1982	Indefinite	$16,600,000
1983	Indefinite	16 600,000
1984	Indefinite 2/	16,600,000
1985	Indefinite 2/	16,600,000
1986	Indefinite 2/	15,886,000

Purpose: To provide Federal assistance to State education agencies (SEAs) and local education agencies (LEAs) to meet the special education needs of eligible refugee children enrolled in elementary and secondary schools. The grants may be used to develop capacity through funding special curriculum materials, bilingual teachers and aides, remedial classes, and guidance and counseling services required to bring these children into the mainstream of the American education system.

Eligibility: The State must have an approved plan for the administration of refugee resettlement programs on file with the Office of Refugee Resettlement in the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).

Administration: The program is administered by the Department of Education via an interagency agreement with DHHS.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS [Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

- To review State applications for funding and to issue grant awards by the end of the fiscal year.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department processed all applications and issued grant awards to States by September 30, 1986.

C. Costs and Benefits

State Allocations: Forty-five States and the District of Columbia received grants for the 1985-86 school year. Allocations ranged from $7,110 (Montana) to $4,675,630 (California).

Children Served: A total of 82,174 refugee children were served during the 1985-86 school year. This figure represents a 13 percent decrease from the previous year because of a slowdown in refugee resettlement.

Geographic Distribution: Although refugee children are located in all States, nearly one-half of the total are in four States: California (23,548), Texas (6,041), Florida (5,499), and Massachusetts (4,738).

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

D. Highlights of Activities: No new information.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis:

No new information. (See FY 1983 AER for latest information.)

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

Not applicable.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Jonathan Chang, (202) 732-1842

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Notes

1. From FY 1980 through FY 1984, Congress also made special appropriations to meet the special educational needs of Cuban and Haitian entrant children. The Secretary of Education requested and received a FY 1980 appropriation of $7.7 million under Section 303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended. Funding for Cuban and Haitian entrants for FY 1981 ($6 million), FY 1982 ($5.7 million), and FY 1983 ($5 million) was made available under Section 501(a) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, as amended as part of the DHHS appropriation. Appropriation language limited eligibility for funds in FYs 1981, 1982, 1983, and 1984 to school districts that had enrollments of least 10,000 entrants. Only Dade County, Florida, qualified. In FY 1985 and 1986, DHHS made awards directly to Dade County rather than transferring funds to the Department of Education.

2. The authorizing statute expired in 1983. Subsequent appropriations have been made under the authority of a continuing resolution.

EMERGENCY IMMIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Emergency Immigrant Education Act, Title VI of the Education Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-511, (8 U.S.C. 1522(A),(C),(D)) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1984:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1984	0 1/	$30,000,000
1985	$30,000,000	30,000,000
1986	40,000,000	28,710,000

Purpose: This program provides financial assistance to State education agencies (SEAs) and local education agencies (LEAs) for supplementary education services and costs for immigrant children enrolled in elementary and secondary public and other schools.

Eligible Recipients: States are eligible for grants under the Emergency Immigrant Education program. Assistance will be distributed among LEAs within the State on the basis of the number of immigrant children.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

o To review State applications for funding and to issue grant awards by the end of the fiscal year.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

o The Department processed all applications and issued grant awards to States by September 30, 1986.

C. Costs and Benefits

State Allocations: Thirty States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia received grants for the 1985-86 school year. Allocations ranged from $29,304 (Iowa) to $14,229,071 (California).

LEAs Participating: A total of 416 LEAs received support to provide educational services for immigrant children during the 1985-86 school year.

Students Served: A total of 422,549 immigrant students were counted for this program for the 1985-86 school year. Of these, 66,139 were also counted for either the Refugee Program or the Cuban and Haitian Entrant Program operated by DHHS. This figure represents a 21 percent increase in student participation over the previous year, when only 26 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia participated.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

D. Highlights of Activities: No new information.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis: No new information.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

Not applicable.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Jonathan Chang, (202) 732-1842

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Note

1. The U.S. House of Representatives passed H.R. 3520 in FY 1984 authorizing this legislation. The Senate never passed a comparable bill. As a result, although an appropriation was made in FY 1984, there was no authorization for that year.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

AID TO STATES FOR EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN STATE-OPERATED AND STATE-SUPPORTED SCHOOLS (CFDA No. 84.009)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981 Chapter 1, P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 3801-3807, 3871-3876) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	Indefinite	$146,520,000
1983	"	146,520,000
1984	"	146,520,000
1985	"	150,170,000
1986	"	143,713,000 1/

Purpose: To provide Federal assistance to State agencies that are directly responsible for providing free public education to handicapped children.

Restrictions on Use of Funds: State agencies are authorized to use these funds only for programs and projects that are designed to meet the needs of handicapped children for special education and related services. Handicap categories include being mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech-impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, deaf-blind, and multihandicapped, or having specific learning disabilities and other health impairments requiring special education.

Formula: Each State's share is determined by a formula that is based on the number of eligible handicapped children counted in average daily attendance, multiplied by 40 percent of the average State per-pupil expenditure (but not less than 80 percent or more than 120 percent of the national per-pupil expenditure). The amount for each State is adjusted in proportion to the appropriation available for distribution.

Eligible Children: Handicapped children in State-operated or State-supported programs are eligible. Handicapped children in local education agencies (LEAs) are eligible if the following conditions are met:

- The child leaves an eligible educational program operated or supported by a State agency to participate in a program in the LEA;
- The child continues to receive an appropriately designed special educational program in the LEA; and
- The State agency transfers to the LEA an amount equal to the sum the State agency receives for the children.

Administration: This is a State-administered program. Applications for project funds are submitted by eligible State-operated or State-supported schools and LEAs to the State education agency (SEA) for approval.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417 (a)]

A. Objective

The principal objective for this program was to provide financial assistance to States for services to eligible handiicapped children.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Continued support to States for handicapped services to eligible children.

C. Costs and Benefits

Students Served: The number of students served has grown by 1.5 percent over the past three years. As the table shows, however, the number of students served who are classified as having certain handicapping conditions has significantly increased, while the number served who are classified as having other conditions has decreased. The number of students with "other health impairments" has grown 55 percent over the past 3 years. The number of students in the "speech-impaired" and "multihandicapped" categories has also increased. Conversely, the number of students served who are classified as hard of hearing or deaf and visually impaired has decreased.

In the larger handicapped school program (see Chapter 302), 72 percent of the students served are classified as having disabilities or speech impairments. In the State program, only 17 percent have these problems.

The average amount spent per pupil under the State program is $572, which is less than the figure for 3 years ago but still significantly higher than the $282 per-pupil spent under the handicapped school program.

Distribution of Children Served by Handicapping Condition

Handicapping Condition	1985-86		1984-85		1983-84	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Specific learning disabled	23,746	9.5	23,018	9.2	22,585	9.1
Speech impaired	21,168	8.4	18,704	7.5	15,880	6.4
Mentally retarded	90,925	36.2	95,108	38.2	97,452	39.4
Seriously emotionally disturbed	44,364	17.7	42,799	17.2	41,474	16.8
Other health impaired	7,806	3.1	7,269	2.9	5,045	2.0
Multihandicapped	20,409	8.1	17,717	7.1	16,808	6.8
Hard of hearing and deaf	21,953	8.7	22,808	9.2	25,615	10.4
Orthopedically impaired	10,780	4.3	11,324	4.5	11,010	4.5
Visually handicapped	8,719	3.5	9,493	3.8	10,330	4.2
Deaf-blind	1,246	0.5	1,005	0.4	1,087	0.4
Total	251,116	100.0	49,245	100.0	247,286	100.0
Average amount spent per pupil	$572		$602		$593	

State Administration: Procedures in SEAs emphasize the total special education program and ensure systematic monitoring of providers for compliance with State and Federal requirements, including the procedures for ensuring fulfillment of the P.L. 93-380 LEA transfer provisions in most States. In most States fiscal accountability is maintained by the SEA and at least one other State agency (E.2).

Program Effectiveness: No new information. (See FY 1982 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services program data.

2. Federal Direction Needed for Educating Handicapped Children in State Schools, General Accounting Office, March 1978.

3. Assessment of Educational Programs in State Supported and State Operated Schools, Rehab Group, Inc., Falls Church, Virginia, September 1979.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417 (b)]

An assessment of the Chapter 1 grants program for handicapped children began in late FY 1984. This study compares the operation of the Chapter 1 programs for handicapped children in States with high use of Chapter 1 with programs in States with low use of Chapter 1. The results have not been published yet.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: William Tyrrell, (202) 732-1014

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. This appropriation shows the amount after the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings sequestration.

HANDICAPPED STATE GRANT PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.027)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), Part B, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 99-457 (20 U.S.C. 1411-1420) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$ 969,850,000 1/	$ 931,008,000
1983	1,017,900,000 1/	1,017,900,000
1984	1,068,875,000 1/	1,068,900,000
1985	Indefinite	1,135,145,000
1986	Indefinite	1,163,282,000 2/

Purpose: To help States make available a free, appropriate, public education for all handicapped children. The program awards grants to States to assist State and local education agencies (SEAs and LEAs) pay for special education and related services to handicapped children ages 3 through 21. These services must be provided in the least restrictive environment and in accordance with an individualized education program that meets each child's unique educational needs. The law also establishes due-process safeguards to provide a mechanism to resolve disagreements between parents of handicapped children and public agencies responsible for providing a free, appropriate education to these children.

Formula: Funds for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are allocated on the basis of a certified count of the number of handicapped children receiving special education and related services on December 1 of the fiscal year preceding the one for which the grant is made.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The program has two objectives:

- To increase services to underserved handicapped children and
- To assure effective implementation of the program.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Between school years 1984-85 and 1985-86, the number of preschool-age handicapped children who were served increased by 0.6 percent and the number of handicapped young people ages 18 through 21 who were served increased by 2 percent.
- During monitoring visits completed this year, Department personnel identified and resolved issues involving procedural safeguards, education in the least restrictive environment, monitoring, and general supervision.

C. Costs and Benefits

Students Served: Since the implementation of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) in 1976-77, the number of children served has continued to grow. In school year 1976-77, 3,485,088 children ages 3 through 21 (less than 8 percent of all children) were served, compared with 4,121,350 (11 percent) in school year 1985-86.

There have been notable changes in the numbers and percentages of children classified as having certain handicapping conditions who have received special education and related services between 1976-77 and 1985-86, as the table shows. The numbers of students served who are classified as visually handicapped, orthopedically impaired, hard of hearing or deaf, and as having other health impairments have decreased dramatically. The numbers of students served who are classified as mentally retarded or as having speech impairments also have decreased. In contrast, the number of students served who are classified as learning disabled has more than doubled; in school year 1985-86, more than two-fifths of the handicapped students served fell into this category.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN SERVED, BY HANDICAPPING CONDITION, SCHOOL YEARS 1985-86 AND 1976-77

Handicapping Condition	School Year 1985-86: Children Ages 3-21 Served by Program (000's)		School Year 1976-77[a]: Children Ages 3-21 Served by Program (000's)	
Learning disabled	1,848	45	797	23
Speech impaired	1,107	27	1,303	37
Mentally retarded	598	15	838	24
Emotionally disturbed	333	8	253	7
Other health impaired	51	1	125	4
Multihandicapped	69	2	NA	
Hard of hearing and deaf	46	1	62	2
Orthopedically impaired	48	1	79	2
Visually handicapped	20	0	28	1
Deaf-blind	1	0	NA	
Total	4,121	100	3,485	100

Sources: E.1 and E.2.

Children were not classified for purposes of this law as a multihandicapped deaf-blind in 1976-77.

Table 2

CHILDREN SERVED, BY HANDICAPPING CONDITION, AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PUBLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, SCHOOL YEARS 1985-86 and 1976-77

Handicapping Condition	School Year [a] 1985-86	1976-77
Learning disabled	4.7	1.8
Speech impaired	2.8	2.8
Mentally retarded	1.5	1.8
Emotionally disturbed	1.0	0.6
Other health-impaired	0.1	0.3
Multihandicapped	0.2	NA
Hard of hearing and deaf	0.1	0.1
Orthopedically impaired	0.1	0.2
Visually handicapped	0.1	0.1
Deaf-blind	0.0	NA
Total	10.6	7.9

Sources: E.1 and E.3.

a. Percentage of fall enrollment, prekindergarten through 12th grade.

The approximate Federal funding share per child also has continued to grow, from $72 in FY 1977 to $282 in FY 1986. Table 3 summarizes this trend:

Table 3

FEDERAL FUNDING BY FISCAL YEAR

Fiscal Year	Number of Children Served	Funding	Federal Funds Per Child
1977	3,485,000	$ 251,796,927	$ 72
1978	3,561,000	566,030,074	159
1979	3,700,000	804,000,000	217
1980	3,803,000	874,500,000	230
1981	3,941,000	874,500,000	222
1982	3,990,000	931,008,000	233
1983	4,053,000	1,017,900,000	251
1984	4,094,000	1,068,900,000	261
1985	4,118,000	1,135,145,000	276
1986	4,121,000	1,163,282,000	282

Source: E.2.

D. Highlights of Activities

None at this time.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Eighth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of P.L. 94-142: The Education of all Handicapped Children Act, 1986 U.S. Department of Education. (also, see previous Annual Evaluation Reports.)
2. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services program data.
3. The Condition of Education, 1985 edition, U.S. Department of Education, Center of Statistics.
4. Other studies of this program are supported by the Special Studies Program (Chapter 313).

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

For studies of this program see Chapter 313--Special Studies.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: William Tyrrell, (202) 732-1014

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. This authorization was established by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981.
2. This appropriation shows the amount after the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings sequestration.

STATE INCENTIVE GRANTS FOR PRESCHOOL SERVICES TO HANDICAPPED CHILDREN (CFDA No. 84.173)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation· Education of the Handicapped Act, Part B, Section 619, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 99-547 (20 U.S.C. 1419) (expires September 30, 1981).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$25,000,000	$24,000,000
1983	$25,000.000	25,000,000
1984	1/	26,330,000
1985	1/	29,000,000
1986	1/	28,710,000 2/

Purpose: To encourage State education agencies (SEAs) and local education agencies (LEAs) to expand educational services to handicapped preschool children from birth through 5 years of age. Grants to States are determined by an annual count of handicapped children ages 3 through 5 who are receiving special education and related services and are counted under the Education of the Handicapped Act. SEAs may use funds received under this program to provide direct services or they may contract with LEAs, intermediate units, or other agencies to provide such services. As a result of Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1986, States will also receive additional incentive grants based upon the estimated number of previously unserved handicapped children, ages 3 through 5 whom it plans to serve.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS [Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

For FY 1986, the Department's principal objective was to award grants to encourage States to expand educational programs to handicapped preschool children from birth through age 5.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The FY 1986 appropriation supported 55 grants under this program. Grants went to 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, and American Samoa. The Virgin Islands and the Trust Territories each received funds under a consolidated application.

The Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1983 expanded the age range of students who can be served with Preschool Incentive Grant funds to birth through age 5 (the program had previously served children ages 3 through 5). As of September 1986, all except 12 eligible applicants had applied for an Incentive Grant. However, the Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1986 has created the Handicapped Infants and Toddlers program to provide services to children from birth through two.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: During the 1985-86 school year, 260,869 preschool children, ages 3 through 5, received services at an average cost of $110 per child. During the program's first year of operation, FY 1978, fewer than half of the eligible SEAs chose to participate in the preschool program. By 1985, 56 agencies were participating. Also, since FY 1978, funds available increased from $12,500,000 to $29,000,000 in FY 1985, then dropped to $28,710,000 in FY 1986.

Preschool Incentive Grant funds are used in numerous ways, depending on State needs. States generally use these funds to provide direct and improved special education and related services to preschool handicapped children, to develop collaborative interagency agreements, to create statewide networks of technical assistance centers, to provide comprehensive diagnostic assessments, to provide training and counseling programs for parents, to train administrative and ancillary personnel, to begin or expand rural service-delivery programs, and to disseminate information.

Program Effectiveness: The number of preschool handicapped children ages 3 through 5 receiving services has increased from approximately 196,000 in FY 1978 to 260,869 as reported in the December 1, 1985 child count. Despite this progress, a considerable number of eligible handicapped preschool children are not being served, in part because of varying State mandates. For example, 42 States mandate services to at least some portion of handicapped children 5 years old and younger. However, only 34 States require the provision of services to all handicapped children aged 5 or younger, and only 8 States require the provision of services to all handicapped children from birth through age 2.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Eighth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of P.L. 94-142: The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, January 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Nancy Treusch, (202) 732-1097

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. Authorization level for the program is determined by an entitlement formula; each State receives $300 (reduced according to the proportion of funds actually appropriated by Congress) for every handicapped child, age 3 through 5, who is receiving special education and related services.
2. After sequestration.

HANDICAPPED REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS
(CFDA 84.028)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), Section 621, Part C, (20 U.S.C. 1421) as amended by P.L. 99-457 (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$ 9,800,000	$ 2,880,000
1983	9,800,000	4,130,000
1984	5,700,000	5,700,000
1985	6,000,000	6,000,000
1986	6,300,000	6,029,000 1/

Purpose: To establish regional resource centers to provide advice and technical services to States for improving the education of handicapped children.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

In FY 1986, the objectives for each of the six Regional Resource Centers and one National Coordinating Center were as follows:

- To help States improve their provision of special education and related services to handicapped children and youths;
- To gather and disseminate information to SEAs, LEAs, and relevant projects of the Department of Education;
- To help States develop successful programs for handicapped children and their families, and disseminate information to professionals and parents of handicapped children; and
- To help States solve persistent problems in providing good-quality special education to handicapped children.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- A total of 450 SEA personnel were trained.
- A total of 700 LEA personnel were trained.
- A total of 2,750 parents of handicapped children were served.
- A total of 300 related-service personnel were trained.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Approximately 4,700 handicapped youngsters are served in demonstration projects.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (please see FY 1982 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies are in process.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Etta Waugh, (202) 732-1052

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. After sequestration.

HANDICAPPED INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS--SERVICES TO DEAF-BLIND CHILDREN AND YOUTH (CFDA No. 84.025)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), Part C, Section 622, P.L. 92-230, as amended by P.L. 98-199 and P.L. 99-457 (20 U.S.C. 1422) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$16,000,000	$15,360,000
1983	16,000,000	15,360,000
1984	15,000,000	15,000,000
1985	15,000,000	15,000,000
1986	15,000,000	14,355,000 1/

Purpose: To support projects enhancing services to deaf-blind children and youth, particularly by providing technical assistance to State education agencies (SEAs) and others involved in the education of deaf-blind children and youth.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS [Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the program continued to focus on priorities that resulted from legislative amendments in FY 1984.

The Department's first priority for the use of funds is to provide appropriate services to those deaf-blind children for whom States are not required to make available a free, appropriate public education under Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act or some other authority.

The Department's second priority is the provision of technical assistance to SEAs. The program also supports demonstration and other projects in areas such as total life planning, changes in State service-delivery systems, communications skills, or the development of social and community skills.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

No new information.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1986, cooperative agreements, contracts, and grants were made for a period of up to 3 years, as follows:

Priority Area	Approximate Funding Level	Number of Awards
Services for Deaf-Blind Children and Youth (State and Multistate Projects)	$7,340,000	39
Technical Assistance to State and Multistate Projects (Supplement)	177,570	1
Technical Assistance for Services to Deaf-Blind Youth Upon Attaining the Age of 22	730,000	1
Demonstration and Other Projects	5,762,422	46
Total	$14,009,992	87

Program Effectiveness: No new information is available.

D and E.

No new information.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS [Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Freeman, (202) 732-1165

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. After sequestration.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
(CFDA No. 84.024)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), Part C (20 U.S.C. 1423) as amended by P.L. 99-457 (expires Septemer 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$20,000,000	$16,800,000
1983	20,000,000	16,800,000
1984	26,000,000	21,100,000
1985	27,100,000	22,500,000
1986	28,300,000	22,968,000 1/

Purposes: To help eligible agencies develop and implement experimental preschool and early education programs for children from birth through 8 years of age and to help States plan, develop, and implement comprehensive systems that provide special education and related services to handicapped children from birth through 5 years of age.

The program supports six types of contracts and grants:

1. Demonstration grants, to develop service-delivery models based on outstanding practices;
2. Outreach grants, to disseminate model programs and help new sites adopt and implement them;
3. Grants to State agencies, to assist in planning, developing, and providing services to preschool handicapped children from birth through age 5;
4. Special project contracts, to provide support services to other program components;
5. Research institute contracts, to conduct long-term research into the problems of young children; and
6. Inservice training for personnel working with infants (new in 1986).

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The major change in the Early Childhood Education Program resulting from the Education of the Handicapped Amendments of 1983 was the increased emphasis on support for State education agencies (SEAs) under the State grant component (formerly State Implementation Grants). For FY 1986, specific objectives for program components were as follows:

- To fund new projects that demonstrate local, State, and regional coordination among agencies and serve children from birth to 3 years of age,
- To fund new outreach projects and to encourage grantees to obtain approval from the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP), and
- To fund State planning projects that are comprehensive and include interagency coordination.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

No new information.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1986 this program supported the following projects:

Type of Project	New	Continuing	Total
Demonstration	30	52	82
Outreach	30	0	30
State Planning	27	29	56
Special Projects	1	1	2
Research Institutes	0	3	3
Total	88	85	173

Forty-one percent of these projects represent joint efforts by universities, LEAs, SEAs, and other State agencies, and hospitals. Eleven percent of the outreach projects have received JDRP approval.

Program Effectiveness: No new information.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

Research institutes will continue to measure the effects of early interventions. A program evaluation is under way. Results should be available in 1987.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Thomas Finch, (202) 732-1084

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. After sequestration.

INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS FOR SEVERELY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
(CFDA No. 84-086)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), Part C, Section 624, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 94-142, 98-199, and P.L. 99-457 (20 U.S.C. 1424) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$5,000,000	$2,880,000
1983	5,000,000	2,880,000
1984	5,000,000	4,000,000
1985	5,300,000	4,300,000
1986	5,600,000	4,785,000 1/

Purposes: To improve and expand innovative educational and training services for severely handicapped children and youths and to improve the acceptance of severely handicapped people by the general public, professionals, and potential employers.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department maintained the same priorities established in prior years:

- To emphasize placement of handicapped youngsters in the least restrictive environments for services, with special attention to the needs of severely handicapped children and youths; and
- To solicit demonstration projects of innovative services for severely handicapped children and youths.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

During FY 1986, the Department supported 106 projects, of which 48 were continuing and 58 were new.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: These projects directly served an estimated 3,300 handicapped persons and indirectly served an estimated 1,200 persons;through the projects, about 180 paraprofessionals and professionals were trained to serve handicapped persons.

Program Effectiveness: There are no current data on the effectiveness of these projects. The Department expects to have data in FY 1987 based on information that is currently being collected.

D. Highlights of Activities

Current projects emphasize the following:

- Models for integrating severely handicapped students into least restrictive environments, including regular classes;
- Models for involving parents in service delivery;
- Models for independent living;
- Vocational training models for severely handicapped youth in high-technology fields; and
- Inservice training services for severely handicapped (including deaf-blind children and youth).

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

None.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Paul Thompson, (202) 732-1161

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. After sequestration.

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED PERSONS
(CFDA No. 84-078)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE:

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA) , Part C, Section 625, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 98-199 and P.L. 99-457 (20 U.S.C. 1424a) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$ 4,000,000	$ 2,832,000
1983	4,000,000	2,832,000
1984	5,000,000	5,000,000
1985	5,300,000	5,300,000
1986	5,500,000	5,264,000 1/

Purpose: To develop, operate, and disseminate specially designed model programs of vocational, technical, postsecondary, continuing, or adult education for deaf and other handicapped persons.

Eligibility: State educational agencies, institutions of higher education, junior and community colleges, vocational and technical institutions, and other non profit educational agencies.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the objectives for these programs were as follows:

- To help institutions of higher education serve handicapped persons by support of model projects and specially designed programs for handicapped persons;
- To provide support for four regional centers for deaf students;
- To encourage postsecondary providers of support services to seek innovative ways to provide such services to learning disabled students; and
- To help handicapped students succeed in regular postsecondary education programs along with able-bodied peers.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

During FY 1986, the Department:

- Held a competition and awarded support for regional centers for deaf postsecondary students.

- Continued funding for 19 ongoing demonstration projects, and
- Awarded 13 new demonstration projects as a result of a grant competition.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: About 600 students are served by interpreters, note-takers, and other assistants regional centers for deaft postsecondary students.

Program Effectiveness: No data on effectiveness are available.

D. Highlights of Activities

- Long Island University, the base for Project MATCH (Metropolitan Area Transition Clearinghouse), is working with disabled students from a consortium of 80 New York area colleges. The purpose is to aid employers seeking qualified disabled graduates through a computerized data base, which includes information on internship as well as long-term employment possibilities. The primary focus is on severely disabled students whose grades are good but not necessarily outstanding.
- A Learning Disabled College Writers Project at the University of Minnesota is analyzing the performance of learning disabled students on wordprocessing applications through micro computer use. Software selection, ease of operation, tutorial aspects of the software, and economy of effort, as well as the software itself, are being evaluated.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The General Accounting Office has prepared a report on federally assisted deaf education. The report covers student cost data, student characteristics, success of the schools in educating deaf students, and the capability of the schools to serve more hearing-impaired students. The study was issued in February 1986.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operation:	Deaf Centers--Malcolm J. Norwood, (202) 732-1172 Demonstration Projects--Joseph Rosenstein (202) 732-1176
Program Studies:	Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. Represents funding level after sequestration.

TRAINING PERSONNEL FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED
(CFDA No. 84.029)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), Part D, Sections 631, 632, and 634, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 98-199 and P.L. 99-457 (20 U.S.C. 1431, 1432, 1434) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$58,000,000	$49,300,000
1983	58,000,000	49,300,000
1984	58,000,000	55,540,000
1985	61,150,000	61,000,000
1986	64,370,000	61,248,000 1/

Purpose: To provide preservice and, in some cases, inservice training for special education teachers, administrators, researchers, teacher trainers, and related service personnel; to develop innovative instructional models for use by providers of preservice and inservice training; and to support training and information activities for parents of handicapped children and youths.

Eligibility: State educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other appropriate nonprofit agencies or organizations.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objective for this program was to target funds on critical personnel shortages.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Supported preservice training in roughly 95 percent of funded projects and;
- Supported 50 projects on parent and volunteer training and information, including a large center for technical assistance to all parent training projects.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The Department supports 799 projects that represent training efforts in each State and in three of the territories. In FY 1986, the Department funded 322 new projects and 477 continuation projects.

The following table identifies new and continuation awards for FY 1986 by priority area:

Priority Category	Number of Projects
Special educators	389
Related service personnel	81
Leadership personnel	80
Regular educators	32
State education agencies	38
Special projects	54
Transition efforts	9
Parent/volunteer projects	50
Infants	30
Rural projects	16
Minority projects	20
Total	799

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1984 Annual Evaluation Report for the latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

Special Education Programs is sponsoring an external evaluation of the training program. Results should become available in 1987.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Grant Files, Grants and Contracts Services.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The Special Education Programs study is in progress. A report will be issued in 1987.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Max Mueller, (202) 732-1068

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note:

1. Represents funding level after sequestration.

HANDICAPPED TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND INFORMATION PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.030)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA) , Part D, Section 633, P.L. 91-230, as by P.L. 99-457 amended (20 U.S.C. 1433) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$1,000,000	$ 720,000
1983	1,000,000	720,000
1984	1,000,000	1,000,000
1985	1,050,000	1,025,000
1986	1,110,000	1,062,000 1/

Purposes: To provide information on educational resources and programs for handicapped children and youths and information on postsecondary educational opportunities for handicapped persons; to provide referral services for the education of the handicapped; and to encourage students and professional personnel to pursue careers in the field of special education.

Eligibility: Public agencies or nonprofit organizations or institutions are eligible; profit-making organizations are eligible only when their participation is necessary for materials or media access.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To provide and disseminate information about services and programs for handicapped children and youths;
- To encourage students and professional personnel to train and work in various special education fields; and
- To collect and disseminate information about services and programs in postsecondary, vocational, technical, and adult education for the handicapped.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Awarded two continuation cooperative agreements for a clearinghouse on education of handicapped children and youths, and a clearinghouse on postsecondary education for the handicapped.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In the second year of a 3-year cooperative agreement, the National Information Center for Handicapped Children and Youth responded to thousands of inquires, published news digests and newsletters for professionals and parents, participated in numerous workshops, and sponsored public service announcements on television and radio.

Also in its second year under the cooperative agreement, the National Clearinghouse on Postsecondary Education for Handicapped Individuals issued newsletters and fact sheets, developed a national directory of transition specialists, and increased the number of institutions in the campus resource file.

D. Highlights of Activities

Year 2 of the current three-year agreement shows continued high demand for The National Information Center's NICHCY's services. About 13,000 individual requests for information have been answered so far this year, with 91 percent of the recipients expressing satisfaction with the response received. More than 12,000 of the Center's printed materials were distributed. An audience of 60,000 parents, educators, and other interested individuals has been reached through the Center's publications dealing with priority issues in special education. Outreach efforts have provided technical assistance and resource sharing to about 45 conferences and work sessions.

Highlights of year 2 include expanded coordination between parent and education groups to avoid duplication of effort; expanded resource sharing with military family support centers; and distribution of NICHCY public service announcements on (1) recruitment of special education personnel; (2) awareness of the abilities of handicapped persons (to 700 television stations and 2,500 radio stations); (3) special publications dealing with such topics as family support and community-based services; (4) information on finding employment and less-restrictive environments; and, (5) publication of a directory of special education training programs and related specialized recruitment materials.

Administrative efficiency measures have enabled the center to triple its output over the past three years even though the staff size has remained constant.

During year 2 of the project, the National Clearinghouse on Postsecondary Education for Handicapped Individuals has seen a dramatic increase in the volume of inquiries up to 1,800 per month. The new toll-free number has tripled the number of telephone requiries. The level of response to the transition initiative has grown. Activities with other organizations such as the Association for the Severely Handicapped, the National Rehabilitation Association, United Cerebral Palsy, and the Association for Retarded Citisens have increased the knowledge base about transition in all organizations. A new national directory of transition specialists has been developed and will be available in September, 1986. It contains, by State, names of people responsible for transition planning. The Clearinghouse has sent out over 10,000 copies of two pamphelts: How to Choose A College: Guide for the Students with a Disability; and, Financial Aid and Disabled Students.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program files, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Helene Corradino, (202) 732-1167

Program Studies: Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. Represents funding level after sequestration.

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS FOR HANDICAPPED--INNOVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (CFDA No. 84.023)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), Part E, Sections 641-644, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 99-457 (20 U.S.C. 1441-1444) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$20,000,000	$10,800,000
1983	20,000,000	12,000,000
1984	20,000,000	15,000,000
1985	21,100,000	16,000,000
1986	22,200,000	16,269,000[1/]

Purpose: To improve the education of handicapped children and youths through research and development projects and model programs (demonstrations).

Eligibility: The Secretary may make grants or contracts with States, State or local education agencies (SEAs or LEAs), institutions of higher education, and other public or nonprofit, private educational research agencies and organizations. In addition, the Secretary may award contracts to profit-making organizations for research and demonstration projects in physical education and recreation under Section 642.

Allowable Activities: Recipients may use funds for research, surveys, or demonstrations related to the education of handicapped children and youths, including the development and implementation of model programs designed to meet the special education needs of such children.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS [Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

FY 1986 funds were allocated according to the following funding categories:

1. Field-Initiated Research: To provide grants for research into subjects suggested by applicants and judged to be responsive to the educational needs of handicapped children and youths.

2. Handicapped Children's Model Program: To provide grants for demonstration projects (youth employment projects and postsecondary projects); to develop, demonstrate, evaluate, and disseminate innovative and exemplary transition services for handicapped youths. FY 1986 is the last year of funding.

3. Technology Research: To award grants for research on handicapped students' use of technological devices and systems in schools.

4. Student Research: To award grants that provide research opportunities for graduate students to enhance their professional training.

5. Enhancing Instructional Programming: To award grants for research on strategies to better accommodate students with learning problems within regular education.

6. Special Populations Research: To award grants for research on educational services for handicapped students who are also substance abusers, dropouts, or migrants.

7. Extant Data Bases: To award grants that use, build on, or expand existing data files for research on issues related to the education of handicapped children or youths.

8. Increasing Teaching/Learning Efficiency: To award grants that focus on teaching and learning methods associated with improved educational outcomes for handicapped students in mainstream classes.

9. Noncategorical Program Options: To award a contract that will examine noncategorical services for handicapped students in four States--two States providing services to handicapped students by category and two States providing services noncategorically.

10. Other Research Activities: To provide contracts for special-purpose research projects that relate directly to improving the education of handicapped children and youths.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The program awarded grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements as follows:

	Priority Area	Amount	Number of Awards
1.	Field-initiated research	$ 7,767,000	83
2.	Handicapped children's model program	2,923,000	27
3.	Technology research	1,061,000	4
4.	Student research	177,000	17
5.	Enhancement of instructional programming	1,165,000	9
6.	Special populations research	566,000	6
7.	Extant data bases	1,157,000	17
8.	Teaching/learning efficiency	744,000	7
9.	Noncategorical program options	450,000	1
10.	Other research activities	259,000	3
	Total	$16,269,000	174

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The outcomes of this program can be divided into three categories: (1) new or improved products (assessment instruments, instructional materials, and technological devices/software); (2) research findings and new information; and (3) personnel trained in research methods.

1. Examples of products:

   a. A study at the University of Virginia developed a method for developing individualized curriculums for oral communication with severely handicapped school-aged children. The resulting manual can be used by classroom teachers and speech therapists. (E.1a.)

   b. A project at Utah State University studied variables that could increase the social interaction between severely handicapped and ablebodied students by training key students in elementary schools. A student handbook and training manual were developed. (E.1b.)

2. Examples of findings:

   a. A study at Teachers College, Columbia University, examined criteria used for decisionmaking regarding the placement of hearing-impaired students. The study found that the most important criterion was academic functioning; I.Q. was second. The considerable discrepancy found among placement committee members suggested a need for in-service training for team members. (E.2a.)

   b. A study in the Pasco School District of Washington examined strategies for increasing the involvement of Spanish-speaking families in their handicapped children's education. The study found that issuing personal invitations, providing of transportation, and making parents feel comfortable about bringing their children to meetings were all important. (E.2b.)

   c. A study conducted by the Montgomery County public schools/in Maryland the effectiveness of early identification procedures from a longitudinal perspective. The study found that although seriously impaired children were successfully identified prior to kindergarten, generally children from families with higher socieconomic status (SCS) were more likely to be identified before the age of four and placed in a self-contained special education program than were children from families with lower SES (E.2c.)

   d. A study conducted at the University of Minnesota examined the extent to which teacher instruction of cooperative skills improved social interaction among cooperative learning groups, including handicapped students. The study found that teacher instruction could increase the number of positive social interactions during cooperative learning activities as well as during noninstructional free-play activities. (E.2d.)

e. A study conducted at Brigham Young University looked at the use of students with behavior disorders as tutors of ablebodied students in academic subjectys. The results showed social and academic benefits for the handicapped tutors as well as academic growth for the students tutored. (E.2e.)

3. Training in Research Methods: From FY 1975 through FY 1985, more than 315 graduate students in colleges and universities received support through the student research program. Another 17 graduate students received support in FY 1986. In addition, at least half of all other supported research projects employed graduate students as research assistants, thus giving the students an opportunity to gain research experience on large-scale research projects. (E.3.)

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1983 Annual Evaluation Report for the latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1a. Final Report--G008400003
1b. Final Report--G008302161
2a. Final Report--G008302278
2b. Final Report--G008300356
2c. Final Report--G008300027
2d. Final Report--G008300020
2e. Final Report--G008300007
3. Student-Initiated Research Program Data.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No further studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Nancy Safer, (202) 732-1109
Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. This appropriation shows the amount after the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings sequestration.

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS FOR HANDICAPPED--MEDIA SERVICES AND CAPTIONED FILMS
(CFDA No. 84.026)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), Part F, Sections 651-654, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 990-457 (20 U.S.C. 1451-1454) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$19,000,000	$11,520,000
1983	19,000,000	12,000,000
1984	19,000,000	14,000,000
1985	20,000,000	16,500,000
1986	22,100,000	16,747,000 1/

Purposes: To contribute to the general welfare of deaf persons by providing cultural and educational enrichment through films and to promote the educational advancement of handicapped persons through use of educational media and technology.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objective for this program was to fund the three major program components: (1) captioning, (2) technology demonstration and development, and (3) educational media and materials centers. The program also funded the National Theater for the Deaf and Recordings for the Blind, Inc. The specific objectives for each program component are as follows:

- Captioning: To increase the accessibility of television and film to approximately 14 million deaf and hearing-impaired persons by developing, adapting, producing, and distributing materials that incorporate the most recent technological advancements in film and television.

- Technology Development Projects: To improve the education, independent functioning, and employment of handicapped persons by assuring that the advances in educational technology are available, are of good quality, and are used appropriately. Funds support projects to improve software for use in special education programming for mildly and moderately handicapped children, and to develop devices to compensate for a particular handicapping condition that might impede educational achievement.

- o Educational Media and Materials Centers: To improve the availability of good-quality materials for handicapped children, their parents, and educators by designing, developing, adapting, and disseminating appropriate educational materials and information.

- o National Theater of the Deaf: To provide support for the National Theater of the Deaf in order to raise awareness about the capabilities and creativity of handicapped persons and to provide for the educational and cultural advancement of deaf persons who participate in the National Theater.

- o Recordings for the Blind: To provide tape-recorded textbooks to help visually impaired students of all ages overcome barriers to learning.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Million of deaf and hearing-impaired individuals have been reached by technological development and other activities related to captioning and recordings. Research in media technology and special educational materials has contributed to the adjustment and education of handicapped persons as well as assisted their parents and training personnel. Through presentations by the National Theater of the Deaf, the self-image of the deaf has been enhanced throughout the United States and in Europe. Finally, Recordings for the Blind, Inc., distributes about 90,000 recorded books to students and records 4,000 new texts each year.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Funds for FY 1986 were spent as follows:

Type of Project	Amount	Number of Projects
Captioning	$11,280,000	61
Technology	3,790,000	10
Media and Materials Centers	699,000	2
National Theater of the Deaf	500,000	1
Recordings for the Blind, Inc.	478,000	1
Total	$16,747,000	75

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

D. Highlights of Activities

During FY 1986, funding from the Department is supporting the manufacture of an additional 33,000 newly designed decoder modules. The units will incorporate the latest technological advances to permit hearing-impaired persons to view captioned television on their home television sets.

Funding was provided for three 5-year studies to investigate the effective integration of technology of hardware and software into the educational process of handicapped children, one study at each of the three educational levels.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Interim annual program component reports.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

An evaluation is in process of the technology position of this program. Results should be available in 1987.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Bill Wolf, (202) 732-1009

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. After sequestration.

EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT--SPECIAL STUDIES
(CFDA 84.159)

1. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), Part B, Section 618, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 94-142, 98-199, and 99-457 (20 U.S.C. 1418) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation
1982	$2,300,000	$ 480,000
1983	2,300,000	480,000
1984	3,100,000	3,055,0002/
1985	3,270,000	3,170,000
1986	3,440,000	3,089,0003/

Purposes:

To assess progress in the implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act, the impact of the Act, and the effectiveness of State and local efforts to provide free, appropriate, public education to all handicapped children and youths; and To provide the Congress with information for policymaking and to provide Federal, State, and local education agencies with information relevant to program management, administration, and effectiveness.

Method of Operation: The Department may award contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements in each fiscal year; most supported activities occur the subsequent year.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

Priorities for FY 1986 were as follows:

- To assess special education expenditures,
- To assess the transition of handicapped persons from school to work,
- To assess the quality of programming at day and residential facilities, and
- To continue Federal-State cooperative evaluations. The evaluations assess the progress of handicapped students, assess programming features of special purpose facilities, identify and clarify emerging issues, and provide evaluation assistance as stated in the Federal Register.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o A mandated study is assessing the cost of State and local expenditures on special education and related services. The mandated study will be available in FY 1987.
- o A mandated longitudinal study was designed to assess the transition to work of handicapped persons following their graduation from high school. The model was completed in FY 1986. The study will be implemented in FY 1987 and continue for up to 5 years.
- o A study is assessing improvements in instructional programs for handicapped children and youths in day and residential facilities.
- o Eight new cooperative agreements with States were begun in FY 1986, and 11 others continue from FY 1985.

C. Costs and Benefits

Studies (New and Continuations)	FY 1985 Obligation	Number of Studies
A. Annual Report		
1. Fast-response network (continuation)	$ 218,000	1
2. Technical assistance in data analysis (continuation)	150,000	1
3. Automated data processing (ADP) (Department of Education) (continuation)	15,000	1
B. Special Evaluation Studies		
1. Longitudinal/child program* (continuation)	172,000	1
2. Special education expenditures[a] (continuation)	712,000	1
ADP (continuation)	60,000	
3. Day and residential programs (continuation)	664,000	1
4. Evaluation of EHA discretionary programs (new)	100,000	1
C. Federal-State Evaluations		
1. Cooperative agreements (new)	875,000	8
Total	$2,966,000	15

---

[a] Mandated

Program Effectiveness: Federal and State staff have used the results of studies funded by this program for technical assistance, training, and public information to carry out the State Grant program and the Preschool Incentive Grants program. Studies also provide the basis for the Annual Report to Congress (mandated by Section 618 of P.L. 94-142) describing the progress toward serving handicapped children. In addition, Department and congressional staff have used data from studies conducted under this program to redirect program priorities of regional resource centers and deaf-blind centers away from the provision of direct services that overlap State responsibilities and toward providing technical assistance.

D. Highlights

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "Education of the Handicapped Funding Priorities--December 13, 1984." Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services program files.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The Special Studies program consists of studies related to Federal funding for handicapped children. None of the studies mentioned here includes assessments of the Special Studies program itself.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Lou Danielson, (202) 732-1119

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. Authorization established by P.L. 97-35, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, in FY 1982 and FY 1983. The P.L. 98-199 amendments to the Education of the Handicapped Act set the authorization for FY 1984 through FY 1986.

2. Adjusted for comparative transfer of $45,000 to Department of Education, departmental management, salaries, and expenses. No adjustments are made for prior fiscal years.

3. After sequestration.

SECONDARY EDUCATION AND TRANSITIONAL SERVICES FOR HANDICAPPED YOUTHS
(CFDA No. 84.158)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), Part C, Section 626, P.L. 98-199, as amended by P.L. 99-457 (20 U.S.C. 1425) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1984

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1984	$6,000,000	$6,000,000
1985	6,330,000	6,330,000
1986	6,660,000	6,316,000

Purposes: To strengthen and coordinate education and related services for handicapped youths; to help them make the transition to postsecondary education, vocational training, competitive employment (including supported employment), continuing education, or adult services; to stimulate the development and improvement of programs for special education at the secondary level; and to stimulate the improvement of the vocational and life skills of handicapped students to better prepare them for the transition to adult life and services.

Eligibility: Grants or contracts are made to institutions of higher education; State education agencies or local education agencies or other appropriate public and private, nonprofit institutions or agencies (including the State private industry councils and local service delivery organizations funded under the Job Training Partnership Act). Grants are made for 1 to 3 years.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

To support cooperative planning demonstrations, secondary education research projects, and two research institutes to conduct long-term programmatic research on the development of skills handicapped students need for community living and working, and to determine the effectiveness of various model projects.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Continued to support grants made in the summer of 1985 that sponsor 15 cooperative planning demonstrations, 10 secondary education research projects, an institute on intervention effectiveness, and an institute on secondary and transitional services.

- Continued support for 16 cooperative models for planning and developing transitional services, 12 employment projects to help handicapped youths make the transition to work, 15 postsecondary projects that link students leaving public schools to community-based adult training programs, 7 research projects to improve strategies and techniques that facilitate transition to adult and working status, and 16 service demonstration models to develop exemplary programs to prepare youths for competitive or supported employment.

- Awarded grants in the summer of 1986 to fund 10 new cooperative planning demonstrations to plan and develop cooperative models for activities among State, intermediate, or local education agencies and adult service providers that will help meet the service and employment needs of handicapped youths as they leave school. Adult service providers include vocational rehabilitation, mental health, mental retardation, community recreation, and leisure programs; public employment; community colleges; centers for independent living; and private employers.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Awards made in 1986 included 10 new cooperative planning demonstrations as well as continuation of support for projects, demonstrations, and institutes first funded in prior years.

Program Effectiveness: The program was initiated in 1984. Continuation applications and Department monitoring indicate that interventions developed in model programs are helping handicapped youths secure competitive and supported employment. Programs are developing training technologies that give handicapped youths access to new employment opportunities.

D. Highlights of Activities

Two noteworthy projects are these:

George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

George Washington University is working with mildly and moderately handicapped youths who have recently left the Montgomery County, Maryland, public schools. This community-based project helps these people explore vocations, plan careers, try out jobs, and find permanent employment; the project also provides extensive followup support. In the first 2 years of the project, 60 handicapped youths were served. Each of the persons completing the program has been placed in competitive employment. Job retention rates exceed 70 percent, and average hourly wages are $4.85. The project is expected to serve 35 more youths in its final year of demonstration. Plans are under way to obtain local support to continue the project after Federal funding expires.

Whittier Union High School District, Whittier, California

The Career Assessment and Placement Center in the Whittier Union High School District coordinates a wide range of services to prepare high school youths for the transition to adult and and work roles. The program includes vocational counseling, vocational evaluation, work adjustment, independent living, training, and job placement. In the first years of the project, 131 handicapped youths were placed in competitive employment. Unique placements in jobs such as meat cutting and auto repair, as well as entry-level placements in the food service industry, housekeeping, and landscaping, have made the program an asset to the business community. The program also has initiated a cooperative program with the Developmental Disabilities Council and has helped 35 severely handicapped persons to participate in supported employment.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The "Evaluation of EHA Discretionary Programs" being performed by the Cosmos Corporation, Washington, D.C., includes an evaluation of this program. Evaluation will be completed in 1988.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: William Halloran, (202) 732-1112

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8365

REMOVAL OF ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS TO THE HANDICAPPED
(CFDA NO. 84-155)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), Part A, Section 607, P.L. 91-230, as amended by P.L. 99-457 (20 U.S.C. 1406) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	Indefinite	0
1983	"	\$40,000,000 1/
1984	"	0
1985	"	0
1986	"	0

Purpose: To provide financial assistance to State educational agencies (SEAs) and through them to local education agencies (LEAs) and intermediate educational units to remove architectural barriers to handicapped children and other handicapped persons. The alterations must be consistent with the standards adopted by the General Services Administration (GSA) under the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968, P.L. 90-480. Funds may be used to alter existing public buildings and equipment that serve handicapped children at the preschool, elementary, and secondary school levels.

Eligibility: The 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Insular Areas were eligible to participate in this program in FY 1986. The Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1985, P.L. 99-457, added the Secretary of the Interior as an eligible applicant.

Formula: Funds for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are allocated on the basis of the number of handicapped children served in each jurisdiction under Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act and under Section 554(a)(2)(B) of Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (20 U.S.C. 3803[a][2][B]). For grants to the Insular Areas, the Secretary reserves up to 0.5 percent of the aggregate amount available under this program. The funds are then allocated proportionately among the Insular Areas according to the number of children ages 3 through 21. However, no Insular Area may receive less than \$15,000.

II. 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

The Secretary allocates grants to the SEAs to assist them in making subgrants to LEAs and intermediate educational units to pay part or all of the cost of altering existing buildings and equipment in order to remove architectural barriers to the handicapped.

B. Process and Accomplishments

Funds have been obligated to Delaware, Iowa, and Vermont and through consolidated grant applications, pursuant to Title V of P.L. 95-134, (48 U.S.C. 1469[a]) to American Samoa, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands.

C. Costs and Benefits

Grants made in 1986 totaled $935,604: $755,604 went to the States and $180,000 to the Insular Areas.

D. Highlights of Activities

No information is available.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

None.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Sandra Brotman, (202) 732-1031

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. Although funds were appropriated in FY 1983, they can be obligated in any succeeding year.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF HANDICAPPED RESEARCH
(CFDA No. 84.133)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, Title II and Section 311(a), as amended by P.L. 99-506 (29 U.S.C. 760-762 and 777(a)[a]) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$35,000,000	$28,560,000
1983	35,000,000	31,560,000 1/
1984	36,000,000	39,000,000 2/
1985	40,000,000	39,000,000 2/
1986	44,000,000	41,983,000 2/ 3/

Purposes: To support rehabilitation research and the use of such research to improve the lives of physically and mentally handicapped persons, especially those with severe disabilities, and to provide for the dissemination of information to rehabilitation professionals and handicapped persons concerning developments in rehabilitation procedures, methods, and devices.

Organization: The National Institute of Handicapped Research (NIHR) funds research and related activities through nine separate programs. Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers and Rehabilitation Engineering Centers represen the largest investment of NIHR resources. Other programs include directe Research and Demonstration, Utilization and Dissemination, Field-Initiated Research, Innovation Grants, and Fellowships. A new program, Rehabilitation Research Training Grants, was instituted in FY 1986. This program provides support for advanced training in research for physicians and other clinicians. NIHR is also responsible for promoting coordination and cooperation among Federal agencies conducting rehabilitation research through an Interagency Committee on Handicapped Research.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To establish a Research Training Grants program, as directed by the Congress in language accompanying the 1985 appropriations.
- To initiate a major new program of research and coordinated activities in the area of traumatic brain injury.
- To focus increased attention and augment information on the economics o disability.

- To stimulate public and private sector involvement in improving access to computers for disabled persons.

- To initiate a series of activities to facilitate the planning and setting of priorities for FY 1988, when a large number of center contracts expire.

- To generate a definitive applied research agenda in arthritis rehabilitation.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- NIHR initiated a Research Training Grant program which provides advanced training in research for physicians and other clinicians. A number of very good applications were received, and three cooperative agreements were funded. Additional awards will be made in 1987, with some additional specification of program requirements.

- NIHR has convened several planning sessions with national experts and government officials to discuss needs for a major program in the field of traumatic brain injury. Papers have been commissioned and further conferences planned. One result of the early meetings has been a greatly augmented research agenda for NIHR, with nine new priority research projects in this field being announced for FY 1987.

- NIHR sponsored a major conference on the Economics of Disability in 1986, academic and government experts participated, and a series of papers was produced. One followup activity will be a disability policy research program, announced as a priority for NIHR for 1987.

- A second major White House Conference on Computers and Disability was held in 1986. The needs of persons with various types of disabilities have been identified and a publication has been distributed to hardware and software manufacturers. The private sector now has an increased awareness of needs for adaptations, and some manufacturers have indicated a commitment to improve computer access for disabled persons.

- NIHR has begun to collect and assess information from a variety of sources to develop its priorities for FY 1988. A participatory planning process is envisioned which will include conferences and commissioned papers on the state-of-the-art of rehabilitation research.

- NIHR cosponsored a major national conference on arthritis rehabilitation, held in Charlottesville, Virginia. This conference generated an extensive but focused research agenda which NIHR can begin to implement through its FY 1988 priorities. The National Institutes of Health, medical colleges, and other interested parties are also being invited to participate in carrying out the agenda.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The composition of NIHR's program is described in the table below:

	FY 1986 Funding in Millions	Number of Projects FY 1986	Prior Year	FY 1987 Estimate
Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers..............	$18.8	36	37	36
Rehabilitation Engineering Centers......................	8.1	16	16	18
Research and Demonstration......	4.8	27	25	38
Utilization and Dissemination...	2.7	22	14	27
Field-Initiated Research........	6.0	69	56	49
Fellowships.....................	0.1	3	12	6
Innovation......................	1.4	29	26	10
Model Spinal Cord Injury Program	(5.0)*	13	13	13
Research Training Grants........	0.2	3	--	6
Total....................	$42.1 Mil.	218	199	203

* Not included in total. See Note 2.

About 500 studies are under way at any given time, and 600 training programs, serving approximately 60,000 participants, are conducted annually.

Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers: Of the 36 RRTCs funded in FY 1986, 12 are medical rehabilitation RRTCs, covering such areas as spinal cord injury, health care delivery, special problems of the severely impaired, traumatic brain injury, and neuromuscular dysfunctions. There are 4 vocational rehabilitation RRTCs, 2 centers on deafness, 1 on psychosocial research, 4 on mental health, 3 on mental retardation, 2 on aging, 2 on independent living, 1 on blindness, 2 for American Indians, 1 on pediatric rehabilitation, 1 on rehabilitation of the disabled persons in the Pacific Basin, and 1 on community integration.

Rehabilitation Engineering Centers: The missions of the 16 RECs funded in FY 1986 are (1) to develop innovative methods of applying advanced medical technology, scientific achievement, and psychiatric, psychological, and social knowledge to solve rehabilitation problems; (2) to develop systems of technical and engineering information exchange; and (3) to improve the distribution of technological devices and equipment to handicapped persons. These centers have developed multichannel electrical stimulation systems that allow paraplegic patients to stand and walk, and have adapted industrial robots to help severely disabled persons function in normal work settings.

Discrete Grant Awards: Approximately $11 million was obligated for research through discrete grants and contracts; slightly less than half is directed research. An additional $4 million was awarded for knowledge diffusion activities and innovation grants.

Program Effectiveness: No new information.

D. Highlights of Activities

See Section B. above.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS [Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A contract was awarded in 1985 for general evaluation of the RRTC program; results are expected in FY 1987. An assessment of the Interagency Committee was initiated in 1986. In FY 1987 NIHR expects to begin an evaluation of major aspects of the Utilization and Dissemination program, the international program, and the Field-Initiated Research, Innovation, and Fellowship programs. In addition, a 1987 fellowship priority calls for the design of one or more models for evaluation of the work of the Rehabilitation Engineering Centers.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Wilmer S. Hunt, (202) 732-1137
Betty Jo Berland, (202) 732-1139

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. Includes a $1.5 million supplemental appropriation for the establishment of the two Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers. The awards for these centers, one for pediatrics and one for disabled Pacific Basin residents, were made in FY 1984.

2. This appropriation does not include $5 million for the Spinal Cord Injury Program funded under the Severely Handicapped Individuals Program (Chapter 328) but administered by NIHR.

3. This reflects a reduction of $1,892,000 under the sequestered 1986 Budget Authority. The original 1986 appropriation of $44,000,000 was further adjusted by the transfer of $125,000 to the Department's Salaries and Expenses account for field reader activities.

REHABILITATION SERVICES--BASIC SUPPORT
(CFDA No. 84.126)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1986, P.L. 99-506, (29 U.S.C. 720 et seq.) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation[1]
1982	$ 899,000,000	$ 863,040,000
1983	943,900,000	943,900,000
1984	1,037,800,000	1,037,800,000
1985	1,117,500,000	1,100,000,000
1986	1,203,200,000	1,144,653,839

Purpose: The purpose of this program is to provide vocational rehabilitation services to persons with mental or physical handicaps. Persons with the most severe disabilities are served first.

Federal and State funds cover the costs of a variety of rehabilitation services: diagnosis; comprehensive evaluation; counseling; training; reader services for the blind; interpreter services for the deaf; medical and related services, such as prosthetic and orthopedic devices; transportation to secure vocational rehabilitation services; maintenance during rehabilitation; employment placement; tools, licenses, equipment, supplies, and management services for vending stands or other small businesses for handicapped persons; rehabilitation engineering services; assistance in the construction and establishment of rehabilitation facilities; and services to families of handicapped persons when such services will contribute substantially to the rehabilitation of the handicapped.

Eligibility: States designate one or two agencies (a separate agency for blind programs is permitted) to administer the program. Physically or mentally disabled persons are eligible for services if their disabilities are a substantial handicap to employment and if rehabilitation services may improve their chances for employment.

Distribution of Funds: Federal funds are distributed to States by a formula based on population weighted by per capita income. The four factors that are taken into account in allocating funds are (1) the 3-year average per capita income by State, (2) the total U.S. population, (3) the State population, and (4) the Consumer Price Index.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department of Education had three goals for this program:

1. Employment: To increase the placement of all disabled persons, particularly the severely disabled, into competitive employment;

2. Management Improvement: To maintain effective management of the vocational rehabilitation service delivery system and the discretionary projects that support the system; and

3. Policy Reform: To reform and reissue a concise body of policy to help States administer the State-Federal Vocational Rehabilitation program and to help eligible disabled persons obtain vocational rehabilitation services under the Rehabilitation Act, as amended.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Employment: The proportion of rehabilitated persons placed into competitive employment has risen steadily in each of the past 3 years for which complete data are available. This proportion reached 78.7 percent in FY 1984 (compared with 74.5 percent in FY 1981) and is at the highest level in more than a quarter-century. Preliminary data for FY 1985 show yet another increase to about 80 percent. These gains have come at a time when relatively more of the clientele were severely disabled. In general, it is more difficult to place the severely disabled in competitive employment. Yet even among severely disabled persons, competitive employment is an increasingly likely outcome. In FY 1981, for example, 65.4 percent of the rehabilitated severely disabled were competitively employed compared with 71.9 percent in FY 1984.

In FY 1986, 10 Program Administration Reviews of State Vocational Rehabilitation agency placement policies and practices were completed, which brings the total reviewed to date to 20. Final data analyses and reports will be completed in 1987. All State agencies developed joint activities with the private sector to use business volunteers and to intervene early at the work place. Nine of 10 Regional Offices of the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) had at least one State agency that developed a home-based work station demonstrating the application of technology. State agencies demonstrate varying levels of sophistication in the application of technology in areas such as rehabilitation engineering, job modification, and computer-assisted occupational information systems; vocational and functional assessment systems; and case management systems. Vocational Rehabilitation involvement with Job Training and Partnership Act (JTPA) programs was assessed with reasonably favorable findings. The status of State interagency programming to develop supported employment alternatives also was assessed.

Management Improvement:

Ten site reviews (one per Region) of State Licensing Agencies were completed in FY 1986, which brings the total reviewed to date to 20. A report on findings will be issued in 1987. Training for state licensing officials and business supervisors was conducted in each Region. Training of State personnel will continue in 1987. Management improvements include the Program Administration Reviews reported above under Employment. In addition, some two dozen State Agency Management Reviews covering potential areas of vulnerability in the management of the Section 110 Program and 19 site reviews of discretionary projects were conducted.

An Executive Work Group was constituted to draft a National Monitoring Plan, which was completed and submitted to the Commissioner and Assistant Secretary. A Data Analysis Plan/System (DAP/DAS) that incorporated three Programs Standards, each consisting of several program measures. The DAP/DAS and Program Standards will be refined during 1987.

Policy Reform: This effort, begun in FY 1986, reviewed all RSA policy issuances to identify and rescind those now considered irrelevant or unnecessary, and identified areas where regulation or legislation is needed. The remaining issuances will be analyzed and rewritten to update the policy base. A computer-based index of all RSA policy issuances, as well as other computer technology, was used to gather and classify reviews of policy documents; approximately 400 policies were analyzed during 1986. The results of this review have provided a basis for action to rescind outdated policies. A policy agenda will be developed for those policies needing to be revised or reissued.

C. Costs and Benefits

RSA estimates that the State-Federal program has become more cost-beneficial in recent years in terms of improving the lifetime earnings of rehabilitated persons--even severely disabled ones--per unit of cost of all closed cases. This trend is supported by program data that reveal declines in the mean cost of purchased services, increases in the mean earnings at closure of rehabilitated persons, fewer rehabilitations into homemaking, and more closures into competitive employment.

An analysis of States' fiscal behavior between FY 1973 and FY 1984 in response to the Federal matching and maintenance of effort provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Basic State Grants Program described factors responsible for State spending choices (E.3). Major findings include the following:

- Between FY 1973 and FY 1984, State matching support for the Federal basic grants program increased notably;
- When Federal and State expenditures in FY 1984 are expressed in constant dollars, the combined amounts are below the FY 1973 level. Total Federal expenditures lost more ground than State expenditures;
- Thirty-two States demonstrated a pattern of matching Federal funds beyond the required 20 percent level; of these, 11 tended to match Federal funds by 25 percent or more. Eighteen other States matched Federal funds at the minimum 20 percent level; and
- The extremes in State matching behavior (at or above 25 percent level and at 20 percent) are associated with a distinct set of characteristics: visibility of the Vocational Rehabilitation agency, attitudes toward the Federal-State nature of the Vocational Rehabilitation program, and the importance of the Federal matching requirement. Matching decisions in the States that fall between these two extremes are subject to shifts in the State's priorities and economic circumstances.

Despite a long history of cost-benefit analyses in vocational rehabilitation, an intensive examination of cost-benefit analyses revealed that no valid national cost-benefit analyses can be done with the program data now available (see E.4). However, the report pointed out that special situations in some States make it possible to conduct a valid analysis. One such analysis found that clients who successfully completed the Vocational Rehabilitation program were more likely to be married and to be working at the time of referral than were clients who did not complete the program. The following services were provided to clients: diagnostic (85 percent); maintenance, transportation, and other (45 percent); educational (25.8 percent); training (19.1 percent); and restorative (10.2 percent). Almost five times as much money per client was spent on education and training as on restorative services. Diagnostic costs amounted to about 1 in 5 dollars spent per client. The major types of impairment were mental (47 percent), orthopedic (28 percent), internal (14 percent), hearing (5 percent), and visual (4 percent). Clients who were hearing impaired were disproportionately more likely to complete the program but mentally impaired persons were less likely to complete. Each client's degree of impairment was rated for each of 30 functional categories. A total of 928 severely impaired functions were found among the 1,670 clients. There was some tendency for the more severely impaired to be less likely to complete the program.

Although no earnings data were available for persons who did not complete the program, an analysis of earnings after 60 days found that (1) more expensive services are provided to severely disabled persons, (2) educational services had a positive effect on earnings, (3) training had a negative effect on earnings, (4) restorative services had no effect on earnings, and (4) severity of impairment had a negative effect on earnings. The extent to which these findings from one State may generalize to the Nation as a whole is not known.

D. Highlights of Activities

The program's 1986 goals and objectives will be pursued in 1987. Further improvement will depend on the outcomes of other planned studies (see III).

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "Caseload Statistics, State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies, Fiscal Year 1985, Information Memorandum, RSA-IM-86-37," May 6, 1986, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Rehabilitation Services Administration.

2. "Characteristics of Persons Rehabilitated in Fiscal Year 1984." This will soon be issued as an Information Memorandum by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Rehabilitation Services Administration.

3. "Patterns in State Financial Match for the Vocational Rehabilitation Basic State Grants Program." Decision Resources, Inc., Washington, D.C. December 1985.

4. Bureau of Economic Research. "Analysis of Costs and Benefits in Rehabilitation." New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University, 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The following studies are currently planned or in progress:

1. "The Analysis of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agency Caseload and Placement Patterns and Trends" is a study to assess trends in caseload activity and effectiveness of different placement practices (to be completed in FY 1987).

2. "The Impact of Vocational Rehabilitation: A Planning Study." This study, which started October 1, 1986, is to develop and pilot-test one or more models of assessing the impact of the Vocational Rehabilitation Programs.

3. "Evaluation of Eligibility Determination in State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies." This study, which started October 1, 1986, is to categorize the patterns and to determine the causes of exception in the determination of Vocational Rehabilitation client eligibility, including extended evaluation. The analysis is to provide corrective strategies and guidelines for future performance standards that may be applied in eligibility reviews. Phase II of the study will continue in FY 1987.

4. "Evaluation of the Validity of Rehabilitation Services Administration Data Reports." This study, which started October 1, 1986, is to determine the validity of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agency reported data, the error rates and causes of error, and the control mechanisms in place to promote valid reporting. The study is also to develop a plan under which RSA may routinely verify reported data against documented facts.

5. "Best Practices Study of Vocational Rehabilitation Services to Severely Mentally Ill Individuals." This study is to determine the role and function of the Vocational Rehabilitation program for severely mentally ill persons; to identify service needs and gaps; and to identify and describe effective systems, service models, and practices.

6. An evaluation of the RSA program for training interpreters for deaf persons is scheduled to begin May 1, 1987.

7. An evaluation of services provided under the Rehabilitation Act for persons with specific learning disabilities is proposed for the FY 1987.

8. An evaluation of State Vocational Rehabilitation agency allocation and internal control of costs is scheduled to begin April 30, 1987.

9. An evaluation of rehabilitation and comparable disability-related data bases will begin in FY 1987.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Mark Shoob, (202) 732-1402

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. Although under a separate authorization, amounts for Federal maintenance of effort are included here.

CLIENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (CAP)
(CFDA No. 84.161)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, as amended, Title I, Part B, Section 112 (29 U.S.C. 732), and further amended by P.L. 99-506 (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982 1/

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$3,500,000	$ 942,000
1983	3,500,000	1,734,000
1984	6,000,000	6,000,000
1985	6,300,000	6,300,000
1986	6,700,000	6,412,000

Purposes: To inform and advise clients of all available benefits under the Rehabilitation Act and related Federal and State assistance programs as well as the rights and responsibilities associated with those benefits; to assist clients of projects, programs, and facilities providing rehabilitation services; to help clients pursue legal, administrative, and other available remedies when necessary to ensure the protection of their rights under the Rehabilitation Act; and to advise State and other agencies of problems in the delivery of rehabilitation services and to suggest methods of improving agency performance.

Eligibility: Grants to States support the Client Assistance Programs (CAPs), which are administered by public or private agencies designated by Governors. Such agencies must be independent of any agency that provides services to individuals under the Act unless the agency designated had, prior to the Rehabilitation Amendments of 1984, served as a client assistance agency under Section 112 and received Federal financial assistance under the Act.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department of Education's principal objectives were as follows:

- To process and award grants for FY 1986 to ensure that a CAP would continue to be in effect in every State and
- To complete a congressionally mandated evaluation of the CAP.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department awarded grants totaling $6 million to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the 6 territories for FY 1986 (the program is forward-funded).

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The first formula grants for CAP were awarded in September 1984. Approximately 29,000 clients received services, including information and referral services in FY 1986, the most recent year for which program outcome data are available.

Program Effectiveness:

The Department completed the second phase of the CAP evaluation; the final report from the contractor was scheduled for completion by December 30, 1986.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "Program Statistics, State Client Assistant Program (CAP) Agencies, Fiscal Year 1985." Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services program files.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

An evaluation of this program began in late September 1984 but because of delays in clearance of the survey forms, the contract had to be extended. The final report is expected by December 30, 1986.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Robert Davis, (202) 732-1297

Program Studies : Ricky Takai (202) 245-8877

Note

1. The Rehabilitation Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-221, changed the funding basis of the CAP from a discretionary project basis to a mandatory formula grant. Funding figures prior to FY 1984 pertain to competitive project grants.

DISCRETIONARY PROJECT GRANTS FOR TRAINING REHABILITATION PERSONNEL
(CFDA No. 84.129)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, as amended, Title III, Part A, Section 304(a) (20 U.S.C. 774), and further amended by P.L. 99-506 (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$25,500,000	$19,200,000
1983	25,500,000	19,200,000
1984	22,000,000	22,000,000
1985	27,000,000	22,000,000
1986	27,000,000	25,838,000

Purpose: To support projects to increase the numbers and improve the skills of personnel trained to provide vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped people.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- To improve the level of skills among, and to increase the numbers of, qualified personnel available in professional fields and program areas where there are shortages of rehabilitation personnel;
- To develop and demonstrate the effectiveness of new types of personnel in providing rehabilitation services and new and improved methods of training personnel;
- To support the training of rehabilitation workers in acquiring and improving job development and job placement skills and in expanding linkages with business and industry to develop jobs for handicapped persons and to place them in employment; and
- To improve the management of the State rehabilitation service delivery program through training and communication.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Facilitated the preparation of new rehabilitation professionals who trained handicapped persons to live independently, to develop job skills, and to seek and maintain employment;

- Developed postemployment training to ensure effective service delivery to, and rehabilitation programming for, persons who have specific learning disabilities;
- Developed program evaluation techniques, a case review system, and a clearinghouse for the management and dissemination of rehabilitation training materials and approaches; and
- Developed training to help rehabilitation workshop and facility personnel use new and innovative techniques in the vocational training of physically and mentally handicapped persons and in the placement of these persons in competitive employment; in addition, provision of transitional and supported employment services was increased.

C. Costs and Benefits

Trainees Served: A total of 13,650 trainees were served under 333 project grants in FY 1986. Costs by type of training are shown in the table:

Type of Training	Number of Trainees	Total Grant Amounts	Average Federal Cost per Trainee
Long-term	3,200	$19,062,000	$5,956
Continuing education	2,300	3,029,000	1,317
Inservice	8,000	2,800,000	350
Experimental	150	947,000	6,314
	13,650	$25,838,000	

Program Scope: The program serves persons with all skills and in all professions relating to vocational rehabilitation of the handicapped.

Types of Benefits Provided: This program is used for a wide variety of training, including long- and short-term training in established professional rehabilitation fields, inservice training and continuing education, and experimental and innovative training projects.

D. Highlights of Activities

To meet the legislative mandate to allocate training funds on the basis of documented rehabilitation personnel needs, Rehabilitation Services Administration is developing instrumentation and a methodology, predicated on previous contractor efforts, to obtain information about shortages in the rehabilitation fields and program areas by spring 1987.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

Program Files, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A contract to develop a basis for making allocations according to documented skill deficiencies and rehabilitation personnel needs was completed in January 1986. Information from the study is being used to develop a data collection for use in making 1987 grant awards.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Delores Watkins, (202) 732-1332

Program Studies : Ricky Takai (202) 245-8877

GRANTS FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF SEVERELY HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS (CFDA No. 84.128)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, as amended, Title III, Part B, Section 311(a)(1) (29 U.S.C. 777a[a][1]), and further amended by P.L. 99-506 (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$12,210,000 1/	$ 8,846,000
1983	12,210,000 1/	9,259,000
1984	12,900,000 1/	6,235,000 2/
1985	13,600,000	9,635,000 2/
1986	14,300,000 1/	17,442,000 3/

Purpose: To support demonstration projects that develop innovative methods and comprehensive service programs to help severely handicapped persons achieve satisfactory vocational adjustments.

Eligibility: Public or private, nonprofit agencies and organizations are eligible to compete for grant awards.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS [Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

For FY 1986, the Department's principal objective was to award grants to support projects for severely handicapped persons in four priority categories: Learning Disablilities, Traumatic Head Injury, Alternatives to Restricted Segregated Employment, and Neuromuscular Disabilities.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Among the 30 continuation projects funded, activities included using computers for rehabilitation and training; coordinating community-based vocational programs for severely disabled persons; assisting persons in the transition from school or institution to work; and providing prevocational, micrographics, and life skills training and transitional employment support services.

C. Costs and Benefits

In FY 1986, 17 new supported-employment projects were funded. In addition, the Administration on Developmental Disabilities in the Department of Health and Human Services transferred $500,000 to the Department of Education for supported-employment projects initiated in FY 1985.

Program Scope: Seventy-six new and continuing demonstration projects address vocational rehabilitation needs of persons with the following disabilities: cerebral palsy, mental retardation, mental illness, arthrogryposis, muscular dystrophy, blindness and other visual impairments, deafness and other hearing impairments, head trauma, learning disabilities, and multiple severe disabilities. Projects also coordinate existing services to more effectively reach target groups, and they conduct outreach and support activities for persons who are not yet receiving rehabilitation services.

Program Effectiveness: According to program office data, successful project methods and techniques are frequently incorporated into State vocational rehabilitation agency programs, sustained with formula grant and non-Federal dollars, and used in part or throughout a State.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

An evaluation of the Special Demonstration Projects for the Severely Disabled is due on March 31, 1987.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No other studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Roseann R. Rafferty, (202) 732-1349

Program Studies : Ricky Takai (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. Total authorization for Sections 310, 311, 312, 314, and 315 combined.
2. Does not include $5 million for the Spinal Cord Injury program transferred to the National Institute of Handicapped Research or $950,000 for the Migratory Worker projects.
3. Includes $8,613,000 earmarked for Supported Employment Projects. Does not include $5 million for the Spinal Cord Injury program transferred to the National Institute of Handicapped Research, $718,000 for the South Carolina Comprehensive Rehabilitation Center, and $4,785,000 for the Oregon Hearing Institute.

SPECIAL PROJECTS FOR INITIATING RECREATION PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS
(CFDA No. 84.128)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, as amended, Title III, Section 316 (29 U.S.C. 777f), and further amended by P.L. 99-457 (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$2,000,000	$1,884,000
1983	2,000,000	2,000,000
1984	2,000,000	2,000,000
1985	2,100,000	2,100,000
1986	2,200,000	2,105,000

Purpose: To establish or initiate programs of recreational activities for handicapped persons, with special emphasis on increasing recreational services for handicapped clients served by State vocational rehabilitation agencies. The diverse recreational activities carried out within these projects are intended to contribute to the rehabilitation, mobility, and socialization of handicapped people.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

During FY 1986, the Department of Education's principal objective for this program was to provide 75 percent of program funds for recreation projects involving both handicapped and nonhandicapped persons.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Seventy-five percent of program funds went to 22 out of 29 indoor and outdoor recreation projects that coordinate services for handicapped and ablebodied persons.

C. Costs and Benefits

In FY 1986, an estimated 16,000 handicapped persons were served by the 29 projects funded.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies are under way.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frank S. Caracciolo, (202) 732-1340

Program Studies : Ricky Takai (202) 245-8877

REHABILITATION SERVICES--SPECIAL PROJECTS FOR HANDICAPPED MIGRATORY AND SEASONAL FARM WORKERS (CFDA No. 84.128)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 312, P.L. 93-112, as amended by P.L. 99-506 (29 U.S.C. 777b) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation
1982	$12,210,000	$951,000
1983	12,210,000	951,000
1984	12,900,000	950,000
1985	13,600,000	950,000
1986	14,300,000	957,000

Purpose: To provide vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped migratory or seasonal farm workers to enable them to obtain employment in other areas, to "settle out" (obtain permanent employment) and leave the migrant stream or to continue as a migratory or seasonal farm worker.

Eligibility: State rehabilitation agencies or local agencies administering a vocational rehabilitation program under written agreements with State agencies are the eligible grantees. Eligible beneficiaries consist of physically or mentally handicapped migrant or seasonal farm workers. Family members may also receive services necessary for the rehabilitation of the handicapped migrant.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objective for this program was to process applications and award new and continuation grants for comprehensive vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped migrant workers.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The Department awarded grants to four new projects in four States and continuation grants to six projects in six States.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1986, nine State rehabilitation agencies and one agency for the blind are grantees for 10 projects serving approximately 3,000 migrant and seasonal workers. The periods of award and grant amounts are as follows:

New Projects	Period of Award	Grant Amount
Idaho	1 year	$100,000
Texas	3 years	222,235 2/
Washington	3 years	132,765
Mississippi	1 year	95,000

Continuations	Period of Award	Grant Amount
California	Third year of 3	$(95,000)2/
Colorado	Third year of 3	86,000
Florida	Third year of 3	77,000
Texas Blind	Third year of 3	77,000
Utah	Third year of 3	77,000
Virginia	Third year of 3	90,000

Services included a heavy emphasis on outreach, bilingual counseling, physical/mental restoration, prevocational adjustment, vocational training, and job placement. Because their clients are very mobile and work in remote rural areas, agencies cannot always complete the entire rehabilitation process or provide vocational rehabilitation services in the traditional manner.

Program Effectiveness: No new information is available, but an evaluation of the program was begun in FY 1985 and results will be available in FY 1987.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

An evaluation of the program by E.H. White and Co. was begun in FY 1985. The evaluation is scheduled to be completed by March 31, 1987. The evaluation has two components: (1) an assessment of projects and their service delivery systems and (2) a description of the condition of currently served and currently unserved but eligible recipients of services.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations:	Frank Caracciolo, (202) 732-1340
Program Studies :	Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. This figure is the overall amount authorized for Sections 311, 312, 314, and 315. The amount for Section 312 is $5 million.

2. California turned back its FY 1986 funding and will operate its third-year project using carryover funds. The $95,000 originally awarded to California was reallocated to Texas.

HELEN KELLER NATIONAL CENTER FOR DEAF-BLIND YOUTHS AND ADULTS
(CFDA No. 84.128)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Rehabilitation Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-221, Title II (Helen Keller National Center Act), as amended by P.L. 99-506 (29 U.S.C. 1901) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$3,500,000	$3,137,000
1983	3,500,000	3,500,000
1984	4,000,000	4,000,000
1985	4,200,000	4,200,000
1986	4,300,000	4,115,000

Purposes: To provide comprehensive services for deaf-blind youths and adults; to train personnel to work with deaf-blind persons; and to conduct relevant research. The primary facility of the Helen Keller National Center (HKNC) is located at Sands Point, New York. In addition, 10 regional offices and an affiliation network refer deaf-blind persons to the HKNC from all 50 states.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To improve rehabilitation services to deaf-blind and multihandicapped deaf-blind persons through the development of a project evaluation and quality assurance system,
- To increase the nationwide identification of deaf-blind persons, and
- To improve services to deaf-blind persons in their communities through the affiliation network.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

During FY 1986, the accomplishments of HKNC included the following:

- The development of a project evaluation and quality assurance system that enables HKNC to improve services to deaf-blind and multihandicapped deaf-blind persons by permitting goals and objectives for each client to be expressed in measurable and observable terms.

- The nationwide effort to identify deaf blind persons was expanded; regional office staff forwarded more than 600 names to HKNC for inclusion in its Register.

- HKNC's affiliation network added 17 deaf-blind persons to those receiving services and expanded its services for 173 other deaf-blind persons. In addition, HKNC affiliates received inservice training on critical issues such as transition, deinstitutionalization, and supported employment.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: During FY 1986, HKNC served 84 trainees at its residential facility and provided referrals and counseling to another 1,225 deaf-blind persons through its regional offices. Approximately 1,150 deaf-blind persons were also served through HKNC's affiliation network. (See E.)

Program Effectiveness: The Department conducted the annual evaluation of HKNC, releasing its report in May 1986. Significant outcomes included a 5 percent increase in the number of clients who were placed in competitive employment following evaluation and training at HKNC's main facility, a 32 percent increase in the number of clients served by HKNC's 10 regional offices, and a 16 percent increase in the number of clients served through the affiliation network.

D. Highlights of Activities

The major highlight was the development and implementation of a program evaluation and quality assurance system.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. FY 1986 Annual Report of the Helen Keller National Center.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A contract was awarded to evaluate HKNC in FY 1986. Results should be available in March 1987.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Robert Werner, (202) 732-1314

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

REHABILITATION SERVICES--PROJECTS WITH INDUSTRY
(CFDA No. 84.128)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, Title VI, Part B, Section 621 as amended by P.L. 99-506 (29 U.S.C. 795g) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$ 8,000,000	$ 7,510,000
1983	8,000,000	13,000,000 1/
1984	13,000,000	13,000,000
1985	14,400,000	14,400,000
1986	15,200,000	14,547,000

Purpose: The Projects With Industry (PWI) program is a Federal initiative for partnership in which corporations, labor organizations, trade associations, foundations, and voluntary agencies work with the rehabilitation community to create and expand job opportunties for handicapped people in the competitive labor market. Training for jobs in realistic work settings, generally in commercial or industrial establishments is combined with support services to enhance the pre-and postemployment success of handicapped people in the marketplace.

Eligibility: Any public or private, for profit or nonprofit agency or organization able to provide training or employment for handicapped persons, including private corporations, rehabilitation facilities, rehabilitation associations, educational institutions, labor unions, trade associations, foundations, and State vocational rehabilitation agencies.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objective for this program was to provide training and on-the-job experience in realistic work settings to an increasing number of handicapped persons, in order to prepare them for employment in the competitive labor market.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1986, approximately 14,500 disabled persons, most of them severely disabled, received services; approximately 12,100 of these people were placed in jobs in the competitive labor market at salaries comparable to those paid to able-bodied employees. In FY 1986, 98 continuation projects were funded.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: During FY 1986, the 98 PWI projects had working relationships with more than 3,500 businesses, corporation, unions, associations, and other groups for the training and placement of disabled persons.

Program Effectiveness:

The evaluation of the PWI program (E.1) reported the following:

- The average PWI grant was $132,000.
- The average number of full-time staff per project is eight.
- The average person served was severely disabled and had been unemployed for at least 6 months.
- Recruitment and placement were the services most frequently provided to employers.
- Employers rated PWI services highly.
- More than three-fourths of all project funds are used to provide services directly to PWI participants.
- Average cost per placement from project funds was $1,452.
- Employers recommended that the projects should have more outreach to the community, that public awareness of project resources should be increased, and that the PWI program should be expanded.
- About 5,000 persons served on Business Advisory Councils.

D. Highlights of Activities

For FY 1987 Congress has mandated that PWI funding be limited to only those projects that were funded during the previous year.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Assessment of the Projects With Industry Program Advanced Technology, Inc., McLean, Virginia, and Policy Studies Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C., February 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No further studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Arthur Cox, (202) 732-1333

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. The $8 million regular appropriation in FY 1983 was increased by a one-time supplemental appropriation of $5 million under P.L. 98-8.

CENTERS FOR INDEPENDENT LIVING
(CFDA No. 84.132)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, Title VII, Part B, Section 711, as amended by P.L. 99-506, (29 U.S.C. 796e) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation
1982	$19,400,000	$17,280,000
1983	19,400,000	19,400,000
1984	21,000,000	19,400,000
1985	22,000,000	22,000,000
1986	23,000,000	22,011,000

Purpose: To provide independent living services to severely handicapped persons to help them to function more independently in family and community settings or to secure and maintain appropriate employment.

Eligibility: The principal eligible applicant is the State vocational rehabilitation agency; however, if a State agency fails to apply for a grant within 3 months after grants are available, any local public or private, nonprofit agency within the State may apply directly.

The Rehabilitation Amendments of 1986 (P.L. 99-506) mandate that current grantees be funded through September 30, 1987 and until 1990, unless the Commissioner determines that a grantee is not substantially in compliance with evaluation standards approved by the National Council of the Handicapped.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To provide continuation grants to operate existing Centers for Independent Living, which offer a combination of rehabilitation services to enable severely disabled persons to live more independently in family or community settings or to secure and maintain employment.
- To promote the substantial involvement of disabled persons in policy direction and management of established centers and to promote the employment of disabled persons in the centers.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Supported 86 current noncompeting grantees:

  -39 State general vocational rehabilitation agencies (including 5 joint projects with State vocational rehabilitation agencies for the blind),

  -23 local nonprofit organizations, and

  -24 State vocational rehabilitation agencies for the blind.

- Funded the operation of 166 existing centers, in whole or in part, providing services to about 48,000 disabled persons.

- Employed disabled persons in the centers (more than 51 percent of staff personnel were disabled persons).

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Effectiveness:

The national evaluation (E.1) mandated by Section 711(e)(2) was reported to the Congress in the spring of 1986. The standards for evaluation mandated by Section 711(e)(1) were developed as part of the study. The 1986 Amendments require their use. Findings from the evaluation include the following:

- The program has been successfully implemented. Centers are being assisted in all States and in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia.

- In addition to the 48,000 persons served directly 56,000 more persons received information and referral services.

- The centers, which participated in the evaluation, reported that an average of 44 percent of operational costs are met with Federal funds.

- A large proportion of the persons served by the centers (48 percent) had orthopedic disabilities.

D. Highlights of Activities

No new information.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "Comprehensive Evaluation of the Title VII, Part B of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, Centers for Independent Living Programs" Berkeley Planning Associates, Berkeley, California, Contract No. 300-84-0209, May 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No new studies related to this program are planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Judy Tynes, (202) 732-1346

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. Authorization for Part B only.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICE PROJECTS FOR HANDICAPPED AMERICAN INDIANS (CFDA 84.128)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-412, Title I, Section 130, as amended by P.L. 99-506 (29 U.S.C 750) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1983

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1983	Indefinite	$ 650,000
1984	Indefinite	715,000
1985	Indefinite	1,430,000
1986	Indefinite	1,340,000 1/

Purpose: To provide vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped American Indians who live on Federal or State reservations in order to prepare them for suitable employment.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

For FY 1986, the Department of Education's principal objective was to further extend participation in the program through a new grants competition and multi-year awards.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Applications were received from five Indian groups, and three awards were made to provide continuing support through FY 1988. Two awards extend the programs of the Navajo and Chippewa-Cree-Rocky-Boy tribes, while the third establishes a new program for the Shoshone-Bannock tribe.

C. Cost and Benefits

Program Scope: During FY 1986, the three grantees provided vocational rehabilitation services to an estimated 1,100 Indians.

Program Effectiveness: Pursuant to the provisions of Section 131 of the Rehabilitation Act, the Navajo Vocational Rehabilitation Program (NVRP) was studied by an independent contractor to evaluate the scope, impact, and effectiveness of the services provided; their comparability with services provided by nearby State rehabilitation agencies; and the availablility of such services to all handicapped American Indians living on the Navajo reservation. Only aggregate comparisons were possible with the Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah agencies, because these States do not provide data for Indians living on reservations. The principal findings were as follows:

- o Scope and impact of services. In FY 1985, services were provided to a total of 502 handicapped persons, and 74 clients were successfully rehabilitated.

- o Effectiveness of services: Compared with programs operated by State rehabilitation agencies, closures are a lower proportion of all active cases, but the successful closure rate--80 percent--is much higher. More than half of the persons who were successfully rehabilitated were severely handicapped.

- o Costs and benefits. The average cost per rehabilitation is twice the cost for all State grant programs ($9,662 versus $4,832), but is similar to costs reported by the Arizona and New Mexico agencies ($7,485 and $10,626, respectively). NVRP achieves private-sector employment off the reservation for 20 percent of its rehabilitated clients, but substantial maintenance costs for travel and subsistence are sometimes associated with these placements.

- o Comparability of services. The NVRP is judged to be a high-quality program: using a comprehensive set of 31 evaluation standards, two independent raters judged the program to be good to excellent on most factors and fully satisfactory on the remaining ones. Coordination with State agencies and success in obtaining supplementary services ("similar benefits") for clients were considered to be especially noteworthy.

- o Availability of services. Both as a matter of explicit policy and actual practice, service is available to all handicapped American Indians living on the Navajo reservation. NVRP staff report having provided services to members of three other tribes--Hopi, Sioux, and Acoma.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Evaluation of the Navajo Vocational Rehabilitation Program, Support Services, Inc., Washington, D.C., July 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

In May 1985 an award of $86,753 was made to Support Services, Inc., of Washington, D.C., for an evaluation of the Handicapped American Indian Vocation Rehabilitation Program. The study was completed in July 1986. Its principal findings are summarized in Section II.C. above.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frank S. Caracciolo, (202) 732-1340

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. This reflects a reduction of $60,000 under the sequestered 1986 budget authority from the original FY 1986 appropriation of $1,400,000.

INDEPENDENT LIVING SERVICES FOR OLDER BLIND INDIVIDUALS
(CFDA No. 84.177)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, as amended by P.L. 95-602, (29 U.S.C. 796f), P.L. 98-221 (29 U.S.C. 796f), and by P.L. 99-506 (expires September 30, 1991). 1/

Funding Since 1986

Fiscal Year	Authorization 2/	Appropriation
1986	$5,000,000	$4,785,000

Purpose: Project grants are competitively awarded under this program to State rehabilitation agencies to provide independent living services for older (55 years of age and older) blind persons to help them adjust to blindness and live more independently in their homes and communities.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS

A. Objective

To award new grants to State rehabilitation agencies to establish and operate programs providing independent living services for older blind persons.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Twenty-four new grants were competitively awarded to State rehabilitation agencies, for an average amount of about $200,000 each.

C. Costs and Benefits

The 24 new projects estimate that approximately 11,585 older persons with severe visual disabilities will be assisted to live more independently, for an average case service cost of about $413.

Program Scope:

A total of 51 applications were submitted by State rehabilitation agencies located in 47 States and Puerto Rico. All the 24 applicants that were approved for funding submitted statements of need based on recent surveys or similar data. These new projects selected target populations including unserved or underserved older blind persons and deaf-blind persons living in rural as well as urban areas. A range of service delivery modes will be used such as mobile units, facility-based and in-home services, and mini-centers.

Program Effectiveness:

No information is available.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

Program Files, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

None.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Judith Miller Tynes, (202) 732-1346

Program Studies : Ricky Takai (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. Regulations for this program have not yet been issued.
2. This program was authorized by the Rehabilitation, Comprehensive Services, and Developmental Disabilities Amendments of 1978, P.L. 95-602, and funds were appropriated for the first time in FY 1986.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--BASIC GRANTS TO STATES
(CFDA No. 84.048)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, P.L. 98-524, Title II, Part A (U.S.C. 2331-2334, 98 Stat. 2450-2454) and Title II, Part B (20 U.S.C. 2341-42, 98 Stat. 2455-57) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 1/
1982	$735,000,000 2/	$587,736,648
1983	735,000,000 2/	657,902,898
1984	735,000,000 2/	666,628,758
1985	835,300,000 2/	777,393,259 3/
1986	Indefinite 2/	743,965,099 3/

Purpose: To help States expand and improve vocational education programs and to ensure equal opportunity in vocational education to traditionally underserved populations.

Eligibility: States and Territories become eligible for formula grants by establishing a State Board for Vocational Education, a State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, and a State Council on Vocational Education. They must also develop a 3-year State Plan, with specified review procedures and assurances.

Assistance to States: Each State and Outlying Territory may reserve up to 7 percent of its Basic Grant allocation for State administration. Part of these administrative funds are to be used to satisfy the requirement that each State devote at least $60,000 of its Basic Grant funds to support the activities of a full-time sex equity coordinator. Of the remaining funds, 57 percent is to be allocated for Part A, Vocational Education Opportunities, as follows: 10 percent for serving handicapped students, 22 percent for disadvantaged students, 12 percent for adult training and retraining, 8.5 percent for single parents and homemakers, 3.5 percent for programs to eliminate sex bias and stereotyping, and 1 percent for serving criminal offenders in correctional institutions.

The remaining 43 percent is earmarked for Part B, Vocational Education Improvement, Innovation, and Expansion activities. Part B funds may by used for any of 24 specified purposes, including new or expanded programs, career counseling and guidance, acquisition of equipment, renovation of facilities, and staff development. For career guidance and counseling, each State must expend at least the amount it expended in program year 1984, and some Part B money must be used for curriculum development and inservice and preservice teacher training. Part B money must be used only for program improvement, innovation, and expansion.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- To prepare and publish new regulations,
- To help States develop new State Plans and
- To review and approve State Plans.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

No new information available at this time.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope

Enrollment Estimates: Vocational Education Data System (VEDS) data for 1982-83, the most recent year for which such data are available, indicate that some 12.9 million participants in Basic Grant programs were included under vocational education State Plans.4/ (These data and the expenditure data discussed later exclude those for Consumer and Homemaking programs, which are discussed separately in Chapter 402).

Expenditures: Financial data from States' Financial Status Reports have been aggregated for program year 1981-82. (Because the Perkins Act programs are so recent, the data here reflect programs under Sections 110, 120, 130, 140, and 102[d] of the previous legislation). These data indicate that the States expended some $679 million in basic grants, program improvement and supportive services, special programs for the disadvantaged, and State planning program funds. These expenditures were matched by more than $6.8 billion in State and local outlays. Approximately 79 percent of the Federal money was used for vocational programs; State and local administration consumed another 9 percent. The other activities that accounted for more than 1 percent of the expenditures were cooperative education (3.5 percent), construction (2.5 percent), work-study (1.5 percent), and industrial arts (1.2 percent). (See E.2).

Program Effectiveness

The new Basic Grants programs are very different from those funded under the antecedent Vocational Education Act, and schools started operating within its requirements for the first time in the fall 1985. Therefore, it is premature to address effectiveness under the Perkins Act.

D. Highlights of Activities

Fifty-three State and Territory Plans for the Perkins Act were submitted and approved.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Reports from Vocational Data Education System (VEDS), U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

2. Vocational Education Report by the Secretary of Education to the Congress: 1983.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A study of the implementation of the Perkins Act is in progress as component of the congressionally mandated National Assessment of Vocational Education.

The Department is currently designing and implementing the plans to meet the data collection requirements of the Act. On September 11 and 12, 1986, the Department's Assessment staff held a design meeting with speakers on a wide range of topics related to the study mandated in Section 403 of the Act.

The assessment staff will submit a plan for the study to the Congress in November 1986.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Leroy Cornelsen, (202) 732-2441

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8362

Notes

1. These amounts include funds apportioned to the States each year under the Smith-Hughes Act's permanent authorization. For FY 1982 through FY 1984, the amounts represent funds for basic grants, program improvement, and supportive services under P.L. 94-482. For FY 1985 and FY 1986, the amounts represent the basic grant under P.L. 98-542.

2. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 authorized $735 million for the Vocational Education Act of 1963 but did not break out authorization by program. For FY 1985, the Perkins Act authorized $835.3 million for Titles I (other than Section 112), II, and IV (other than Part E).

3. Figures listed are those appropriated for Basic State Grant. Funds for Indian and Hawaiian Native Programs are included in a separate chapter.

4. Early in 1983, the Department suspended collection of VEDS data because of continuing problems with the system. Because the Perkins Act mandates the operation of a vocational education data system, the Department is developing a system to take the place of VEDS. The Center for Statistics plans to provide a report to Congress in 1988.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION
(CFDA No. 84.049)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, Title III, Part B, P.L. 98-524 (20 U.S.C. 2361-2363; 98 Stat. 2458-2459) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	1/	$29,133,000
1983	1/	31,633,000
1984	1/	31,633,000
1985	$32,000,000	31,633,000
1986	Indefinite	30,273,000

Purpose: To assist States by providing Federal funds for programs and services in consumer and homemaking education.

Eligibility: States become eligible for formula grants by establishing a State Board for Vocational Education, a State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, a State Council on Vocational Education, and a 3-year State Plan, with specified review procedures and assurances.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

For FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives were to encourage States as follows:

- To revise program offerings in consumer and homemaking education in secondary schools in light of recent national education reports,
- To engage educators and business and industry representatives in jointly designing and updating curriculum, and
- To promote sex equity and to increase participation in economically depressed areas.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- No new information is available.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Approximately one-fourth of vocational studies in high school taken by women is in consumer and homemaking courses, according to data from the Department's *High School and Beyond* study.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1984 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "State Annual Accountability Reports for Vocational Education," Division of Vocational Education Services, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The study of the implementation of the Perkins Act in progress will include information on consumer and homemaking programs.

States and universities are conducting research in cooperation with professional organizations and the private sector.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Bertha G. King, (202) 732-2421

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8364

Note

1. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 authorized $735 million for the Vocational Education Act but did not break out authorization by individual program.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS PROGRAMS
(No CFDA Number)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, P.L. 98-524, Title III, Part A (20 U.S.C. 2351-2393; 98 Stat. 2457-2465) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding since 1985

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1985	$15,000,000	--
1986	Indefinite	$7,178,000

Purpose: To provide financial assistance to States for vocational education support programs by community-based organizations under Part A.

Eligibility for Part A: Community-Based Organizations. States may receive funds by including information and assurances required in the Act in State plans or amendments. Each community-based organization that desires to receive assistance under this part shall prepare an application jointly with an appropriate eligible recipient for the submission to the State Board for Vocational Education. Each application will include an agreement between the community-based organization and the eligible recipient as outlined in the Act.

States received funds ranging from $35,890 to $629,637. No information is currently available about how States established priorities or what types of programs were funded.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

This is the first year that funds have been appropriated for this program.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

Studies related to this program are being planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Leroy Cornelsen, (202) 732-2441

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8364

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--RESEARCH AND OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION
(CFDA No. 84.051)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, P.L. 98-524, Title IV, Parts A and B, Sections 401-404, and 422 (20 U.S.C. 2401-2404 and 2422; 98 Stat. 2466-2468, and 2473) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 1/
1982	2/	$ 8,536,073
1983	2/	8,036,073
1984	2/	8,178,000
1985	3/	10,321,000
1986	Indefinite	9,707,000

Purposes: To conduct research, furnish information, and provide related support services designed to improve access of disadvantaged persons to vocational education programs; to stimulate private-sector involvement; to promote more effective coordination at all levels among programs dealing with vocational education, employment training, and economic development; and to strengthen existing programs through the development and dissemination of curriculum materials, increased emphasis on acquisition of basic academic skills, new evaluation methods, and current information on occupational supply and demand. These purposes are addressed through the activities of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE), the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC), Curriculum Coordination Centers (CCCs), and the one-time national assessment mandated by Section 403 of the Perkins Act. Further purposes associated with these activities are as follows:

- NCRVE. NCRVE is a nonprofit, university-affiliated entity designated by the Secretary for a 5-year period on the advice of a panel of nationally recognized experts in vocational education, administration, and research. In addition to addressing the purposes described above, NCRVE is charged with developing State and local leadership; facilitating national planning and policy development; providing technical assistance to programs serving special populations; acting as a clearinghouse on State and Federal research, curriculum, and personnel development activities; working with public agencies to develop methods of program planning and evaluation; and reporting annually to Congress on joint planning and coordination under the Perkins Act and the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).

- NOICC. Composed of members representing the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, and Labor, plus four offices of the Department of Education, NOICC is charged with developing and implementing, in cooperation with State and local agencies, an occupational information system to meet a comprehensive range of planning, program administration, and career guidance needs.

- CCCs. Working with State liaison representatives in their regions, the six CCCs identify, document, and disseminate curriculum materials in vocational education, provide followup assistance in support of local adaptations and uses of those materials, and collect information on the associated educational impacts and cost savings.

- National assessment. This mandated study is charged with evaluating the impact of the Perkins Act on vocational education and the effectiveness of vocational education programs in the Nation.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- To begin the National Assessment of Vocation Education mandated in Section 403 of the Carl D. Perkins Act.

- To convert the NCRVE contract into a grant relationship, while ensuring continuity in NCRVE's basic mission and appropriate follow-through on work initiated under the third-year contract.

- To further expand the scope of research on vocational education for special populations.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Staffing was completed for the National Assessment, preliminary consultations were conducted, a national planning conference was held, and procurement actions are now under way for major components of the assessment, along with necessary technical support.

- NCRVE's plan for the first grant year, which began January 16, 1986, builds on and significantly extends the work performed under the previous contract.

- Research was initiated on bilingual vocational education.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1986, program funds were allocated as follows:

NCRVE	$5,742,000
NOICC	2,201,000
Curriculum Coordination Centers	751,000
National Assessment	1,013,000
TOTAL	$9,707,000

Program Effectiveness: Information on the activities of NCRVE, NOICC, and the Curriculum Coordination Centers follows.

NCRVE. In FY 1986, NCRVE completed its third-year contractual obligations and embarked on the first year of operation under the new grant arrangement mandated by the Perkins Act. Two new studies have been initiated with a view to achieving a better understanding of such basic matters as the dynamics of vocational classrooms and postsecondary education. Other studies now under way will examine the self-perceptions of beginning vocational teachers concerning their ability to teach basic skills and work with special student populations. Syntheses of previous work are being compiled and packaged for distribution in such areas as basic skills instruction, youth counseling, and adult education. The effectiveness of the planning between vocational education and JTPA is also being assessed.

NOICC. Over the past 4 years, NOICC's primary objective has been to maintain the level of basic assistance grants to States in support of their program planning and career information systems. These grants now amount to 89 percent of all NOICC funds. During the past program year, the number of States with microcomputer-based systems for program planning rose from 12 to 25, due in great part to development grants and technical guidance provided by NOICC. Career information services have also been expanded and upgraded through NOICC incentive grants and special training for counselors cosponsored by the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration, the Department of Defense, and NOICC.

Curriculum Coordination Centers. According to information provided by the six CCCs for the 1985 calendar year, a total of 82,000 clients were served through dissemination of curriculum materials, conduct of special searches, provision of technical assistance, and site visits. These services produced a total of 527 adoptions or adaptations of curriculum products. Total savings associated with these curricular adoptions and adaptations, as estimated by the six centers, amount to $9.5 million. Center estimates of savings per adoption vary, however, from an average of $4,500 at the Western Center to $45,500 at the Northwestern Center.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. The Curriculum Coordination Centers Impact Report for 1985. Office of Vocational and Adult Education, March 1986.

2. Status of the NOICC/SOICC Network, June 30, 1986. NOICC Administrative Report No. 12, August 1986.

3. Impact Report of the National Center for 1986. Office of Vocational and Adult Education, 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

The first phase of a nine-State study of steps taken to implement provisions of the Perkins Act was completed in FY 1986, and an option to extend this work was exercised. Procurement actions in support of the National Assessment were still pending at the close of the year.

Contacts for Further Information

NCRVE and CCCs Program Operations : Glenn Boerrigter, (202) 732-2367

Sponsored Research : Muriel Shay Tapman, (202) 732-2361

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

National Assessment : John Wirt, (202) 245-8281

Notes

1. These amounts include funds from the Smith-Hughes Act permanent appropriation.

2. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 authorized $735 million for the Vocational Education Act for FY 1982 - FY 1984, but did not break out authorization by program.

3. For 1985, Section 3(a) of the Perkins Act authorized $835,300,000 for Titles I (exclusive of Section 112), II, and IV (other than Part E). From the amount appropriated for Section 3(a), Section 101 reserves 2 percent for national programs under Title IV.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--INDIAN AND HAWAIIAN NATIVE PROGRAMS
(CFDA No. 84.101)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, P.L. 98-542, Title I, Section 123 (20 U.S.C. 2313; 90 Stat. 2440) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 1/	
		Indians	Hawaiian Natives
1982	2/	$5,936,734	NA
1983	2/	6,645,484	NA
1984	2/	6,733,624	NA
1985	$835,300,000	9,895,630	$1,979,128
1986	Unspecified	9,564,364	1,912,873

Purpose: To award grants and contracts to eligible Indian tribes and to organizations that primarily serve and represent Hawaiian natives (1985-1986); and to plan, conduct, and administer programs or portions of programs authorized by and consistent with the Vocational Education Act. Eligible applicants may apply for grants for any programs, services, and activities cited as consistent with the Act.

Eligibility: The tribal organization or any Indian tribe eligible to contract with the Secretary of the Interior for the administration of programs under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 or under the Act of April 16, 1934 is eligible for funds under this program. Any organization that primarily serves and represents Hawaiian natives and is recognized by the Governor of Hawaii may apply for funds.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The program office addresses the following objectives:

Indian Programs:

1. To improve the job placement record of trainees served under this authority,
2. To promote program linkages to tribal economic development plans, and
3. To encourage small tribes not previously funded to submit good-quality applications and to work with other tribes to increase the quality of their proposals.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o The Department awarded a contract to train small tribes and develop materials for improving application development in 1985.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope

Trainees: An estimated 3,800 Indian trainees in 20 States were enrolled in vocational programs in 45 grants in FY 1986. Training was offered in a wide range of occupations including public administration, business management, welding, clerical work, auto mechanics, appliance repairs, heavy-equipment operation, road building, construction, agriculture, carpentry, plumbing, bookkeeping, and computer programming. (E.1.)

Costs: Costs vary widely; the smallest Indian grant was $45,429, whereas the largest grant was $556,099. Enrollment ranges from 12 to 300 students. Some programs carry a high per-pupil cost because of the type of equipment needed and the isolation of the location. High-cost programs include computer programming and heavy-equipment operation.

Program Effectiveness: Program officials estimate that placement rates for programs designed for immediate trainee placement are about 65 percent. The target population served by these programs has a history of disadvantagement and high unemployment. Priority is given to projects that are designed to provide training to Indians who cannot afford to leave the reservation to attend schools.

D. Highlights of Activities

- o Increasing the job placement rate continued as a priority for the Indian program. Generally the projects are reported as meeting their placement goals.

Hawaiian Native Program

A. Objectives

1. To improve linkages with the applicant and the State education agency to avoid duplication of effort and
2. To achieve a 65 percent placement record for trainees served in this program.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o One grant was issued to Alu Like, the Native Hawaiian organization designated by the governor as eligible to recieve funds, for 18 months. Twenty-five training activities will be completed by December 1986.

- A curriculum specialist and an inservice vocational teacher trainer have been added to the Alu Like staff to strengthen program planning efforts.

Costs and Benefits

Costs: The primary grants, which range from $20,000 to $50,000 each, fund 25 training projects for 350 trainees. Because start-up grant costs include training, project development, and instructor training, no accurate projections of costs per trainee or per trainee who completes this training are available at this time. Stipends are available to persons who need them.

Benefits: No information is available because the initial grant is not completed.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Project Summary data.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for further information

Program Operations: Howard Hjelm, (202) 732-5550

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. The Perkins Act requires that 1.5 percent of vocational education funds, including those from Smith-Hughes, be used to support Indian and Hawaiian native programs; of this amount, 1.25 percent supports Indian projects and 0.25 percent, Hawaiian ones.

2. The Omnibus Budget Reconcilitation Act of 1981 authorized $735 million for the Vocational Education Act of 1963, but did not break out authorization by program. For FY 1985, the Perkins Act authorized $835.3 million for Basic Grant authorization.

BILINGUAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS
(CFDA Nos. 84-077, 84-099, and 84-100)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, P.L. 98-524 Title IV, Part E, Section 441 (20 U.S.C. 2441; 98 Stat. 2477) (expires September 30, 1989).

Regulations: 34 CFR Part 79, 407-409.

Funding Since 1982:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	1/	$3,686,000
1983	1/	3,686,000
1984	1/	3,686,000
1985	$3,700,000	3,686,000
1986	Indefinite	3,527,000

Purpose: Bilingual Vocational Training (BVT). The BVT program provides financial assistance for bilingual vocational education and training to prepare persons with limited English proficiency (LEP) for jobs in recognized occupations and in new and emerging occupations. Funds may be used for training LEP persons who have completed or left elementary or secondary schools and are available for education in a postsecondary educational institution, or who have already entered the labor market and desire or need training or retraining to achieve year-round employment, to adjust to changing manpower needs, to expand their range of skills, or to advance in employment. Project activities must include instruction in the English language to ensure that participants will be equipped to pursue occupations in an English-language environment. In Puerto Rico, provision may be made for the needs of students of limited Spanish proficiency.

Bilingual Materials, Methods, and Techniques (BVMMT). BVMMT projects assist in the development of instructional and curriculum materials, methods, or techniques for bilingual vocational training programs including (1) research in bilingual vocational training; (2) training programs to familiarize State agencies and training institutions with research findings and with successful pilot and demonstration projects; and (3) experimental, developmental, pilot, and demonstration projects.

Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training (BVIT). BVIT projects train instructors to work in BVT programs.

Eligible Recipients: For the BVT program, appropriate State agencies, local education agencies, postsecondary educational institutions, for-profit agencies, private, nonprofit vocational training institutions, and other nonprofit organizations specifically created to serve persons who normally use a language other than English are eligible. Private, for-profit agencies and organizations are eligible to apply for contracts only. Before making an award for the BVIT program, the Department must consult with the State Board for Vocational Education "to ensure an equitable distribution of assistance among populations of individuals with limited English proficiency within the State."

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The program continues to emphasize several objectives from FY 1985 and has added or modified several objectives for FY 1986.

- To use Federal discretionary dollars to increase the effectiveness of bilingual vocational training programs throughout the country. Projects funded through these programs should serve as models for other bilingual vocational education programs through networking, inservice training, materials development, and information sharing.
- To encourage interaction between State staff responsible for vocational education instruction of LEP persons and directors of federally funded bilingual vocational projects.
- To encourage greater involvement of the private sector in bilingual vocational training projects.
- To use existing adult, vocational, and bilingual education networks with particular emphasis on those that include State vocational and adult education department personnel, including the National Network for Curriculum Coordination of Vocational Technical Education, and the National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
- To document efforts to improve training under the program during the grant period.
- To strengthen the relationship between bilingual vocational training and instructor training programs.
- To ensure that applications for funding under Bilingual Vocational Materials, Methods, and Techniques are for the types of projects listed in Section 409.10 of the regulations governing the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act.

B. Progress and Accomplishments: Six multi-year grants were considered for continuation with FY 1986 funds. One BVT project and one BVIT project were reduced in scope.

- All new BVT and BVMMT applications for FY 1986 funding were reviewed by panels that included at least two Federal experts and two other reviews.

- No new BVIT awards were made because funds were sufficient only for continuation projects. BVIT applications were returned to the submitters. Problems related to many of the projects funded under BVIT also became apparent.

- In January 1985, the responsibility for bilingual vocational education discretionary programs was transferred to the office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), which found that most of the current BVIT projects did not train instructors to work in BVT programs. In many cases, BVIT projects committed funds for 4 years or more to ensure that a participant received a bachelor's degree but did not make sure that the trainee was learning to work specifically with the adults for which the BVT projects are designed. We have not been able to determine whether the graduates are actually teaching in BVT projects. Discussions with BVT project directors and visits to project sites, moreover, have indicated that there is a great need for more and better inservice training throughout the life of the projects. Consequently, OVAE is planning to make inservice training projects a priority for FY 1987.

- Two BVMMT FY 1985 contracts were completed during FY 1986. One project identified and disseminated bilingual vocational training materials developed by 175 prior projects; the project produced an annotated bibliography of over 300 items and a collection of materials, both of which will be made available to each of the six OVAE-supported Curriculum Coordination Centers. The other project reviewed field-tested consumer education training modules and adapted them for use by LEP persons. Arrangements have been made with the DHHS, Office of Refugee Assistance, to field-test the modules for use by such persons.

- A contract was awarded to develop an evaluation design for BVT projects.

- To encourage non-Federal support for BVT programs, two contracts were awarded, one to encourage use of the BVT federally developed program by local agencies and the other to encourage teams of State staff to work with local people and the private sector to gain their support for BVT programs.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program	Number of Projects	Number Served	Funds Available During FY 1987
BVT	21	1,725	$4,442,488
BVIT	3	116	$535,950
BVMMT	5	227	$721,300

(Funds available for obligation during FY 1987).

Types of Benefits Provided:

BVT--Cost of instruction is paid for LEP students who are being trained for gainful employment as semi-skilled or skilled workers in an English-language training program. Allowances may also be paid.

BVIT--Cost of instruction or fellowship/trainee costs are paid for persons who are teaching or preparing to teach in bilingual vocational education and training programs. Benefits can be paid for in service or pre service training.

BVMMT--Costs can be paid for participants to attend workshops or to undertake other activities for which travel is necessary.

D. Highlights of Activities

No new information.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

No new information.

Program Effectiveness:

No new information until current projects will be completed. See FY 1982 AER for prior information.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The National Assessment of Vocational Education will include studies of BVT.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Ron Castaldi, (202) 732-2359

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 authorized $735 million but did not break out authorization by individual programs.

ADULT EDUCATION--GRANTS TO STATES
(CFDA No. 84.002)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Adult Education Act, P.L. 91-230, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1201) (expires September 30, 1988).

Funding Since 1982

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$100,000,000	$ 86,400,000
1983	100,000,000	95,400,000
1984	100,000,000	100,000,000
1985	140,000,000	101,963,000
1986	Indefinite	97,579,000 1/

Purpose: To expand educational opportunities for adults and to encourage the establishment of programs of adult education that will enable all adults to acquire the literacy and other basic skills necessary to function in society, to complete secondary school, and to profit from employment-related training.

Eligibility and Formula: The States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are allotted a basic grant of $250,000; the Outlying Territories (Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) are allotted a basic grant of $100,000. The remainder of the funds are allotted according to the proportion of their adult population that lack a secondary school certificate (or its equivalent) and are not required to be enrolled in such schools.

Funds are distributed to local educational agencies (LEAs) or to other public or private agencies based on applications submitted to State educational agencies.

Services Provided by Recipient Agencies: LEAs or other agencies funded by the State provide training in basic skills or secondary education services to persons 16 years of age or older, or who are beyond the age of compulsory school attendance. Each State is required to match Federal funds at a rate of 10 cents for every 90 cents of Federal money received. (No match is required of Outlying Territories.) Each State must use at least 10 percent of its grant for special projects and teacher training. State grants also support programs for adults with limited English proficiency, for residents of urban areas with high unemployment rates, for residents of rural areas, and for institutionalized adults.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS

A. Objectives

During FY 1986 the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To improve and expand the outreach capacity of the program, especially in the area of basic literacy instruction;
- To disseminate information on effective practices;
- To improve service delivery to program participants; and
- To study ways of reducing adult illiteracy.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- A new survey by the Center for Statistics (E.3) shows that 4,200 programs are now providing literacy instruction to adults. Basic literacy instruction (below fourth-grade level) is being provided by 86 percent of these programs.
- The Clearinghouse on Adult Education, although no longer directly authorized, continues to disseminate information on effective practices. Four area networks have been established to improve sharing of information on adult education among States and to strengthen the Division of Adult Education's monitoring activities with States.
- This program has improved the provision of support services, made scheduling more flexible, arranged convenient locations for classes, and encouraged the use of instructional materials and methodologies more appropriate to adult education.
- A cost-benefit model design study was completed and a pilot project was recommended (see E.2).

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: FY 1985 monies were distributed for use in FY 1986 as follows: (1) Outlying Territories received a minimum of $100,000; (2) each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico received a minimum of $250,000; and (3) the remainder was divided on the basis of the number of persons age 16 and over with less than a high school education, based on the 1980 Census. Thirty-four States had grants of more than $1 million, with the four largest grants going to California ($8,135,355), New York ($7,184,087), Texas ($6,231,341), and Pennsylvania ($5,003,792). The smallest State grant went to Alaska for $335,822 (E.1).

In FY 1985, States distributed about 61 percent of grant funds to local educational agencies (LEA's), 7 percent to intermediate education agencies, 5 percent to State agencies, 21 percent to colleges and universities, and 6 percent to institutions and other agencies. These subgrants tended to be small, with nearly 40 percent being less than $10,000 (median $10,356).

In FY 1985, 2.9 million adults participated in the program, more than one-fourth of whom received instruction in English as a second language (ESL). Approximately 80 percent of the participants are between 16 and 44 years old. More than 24,000 trained literacy volunteers served in basic education and English as a second language classes. Of these volunteers, 85 percent served as tutors on a one-to-one basis (E.1).

Those benefiting from adult education, support services, and associated personnel development efforts included such .groups as adults with limited English proficiency; adults in urban areas with high rates of unemployment; adults in rural areas; immigrant adults; and personnel such as administrators, supervisors, teachers, and paraprofessionals.

States continued their efforts to improve the quality of instructional services through special experimental demonstration projects and teacher training projects. Projects trained administrators, supervisors, teachers, and paraprofessionals. Major program areas for special projects included English as a second language, employability, adults with disabilities, technology, literacy, and volunteerism.

The majority of Federal funds were spent on various types of instructional activities through grants made by the States to local providers. All States are required to emphasize adult basic education programs. States must provide assurance that special assistance will be given to persons with limited English proficiency. ESL instruction is a priority of the legislation.

Collection of demographic data from the States has not been required since FY 1981. Reports submitted voluntarily by States for the 1984-85 school year provide the following information:

Total number of participants..................	2,879,000
Number of participants by level	
Level I particpants (grades 0-8 and ESL).....	2,146,000
Level II participants (grades 9-12)..........	733,000

Program Effectiveness. Information from State performance reports and the recent survey of adult literacy programs (E.3) shows the following types of impacts:

- Educational outcomes: 203,000 participants passed the GED (General Educational Development) test in 1985. An additional 51,800 participants obtained a high school diploma.
- Economic impacts: In FY 1985, 85,500 participants obtained jobs, 49,500 received promotions, and 19,000 were removed from public assistance rolls (Note: There is no data on the economic progress of nonparticipants in 1985 with which to assess the impact of the program).

- State and local matching: Over the 20-year life of this program the matching rate has risen from the required 10 percent to 68 percent. In FY 1984, the last year for which data are available, State and local funds accounted for more than two-thirds of total expenditures.

- Contribution of volunteers: Three-fourths of all adult literacy programs offer individual tutoring, most of which is provided by volunteers. Recent survey findings indicate that 107,000 volunteers are contributing to this effort (E.3).

- Unmet need: As of 1985, one-third of all adult literacy programs had waiting lists of persons wishing to receive service. Nationally, this backlog is estimated at 76,000 persons (E.3).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Annual State financial and performance reports.
2. Sherman, J.S., and Stromsdorfer, E.W. Model for Benefit-Cost Analysis of Adult Education Programs. Pelavin Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1984.
3. Adult Literacy Programs: Services, Persons Served, and Volunteers, Center for Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., April 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Karl O. Haigler, (202) 732-2270

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. This reflects a reduction of $4,384,000 under the sequestered FY 1986 budget authority from the original FY 1986 appropriation of $101,963,000.

OFFICE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

PELL (BASIC EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY) GRANT PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.063)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Section 411, P.L. 92-318, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	Indefinite	$2,419,040,000
1983	"	2,419,040,000
1984	"	2,800,000,000
1985	"	3,862,000,000[1]
1986	"	3,578,000,000[2]

Purpose: To help qualified students meet the costs of their undergraduate education at eligible institutions of higher education. The program is intended to improve access to postsecondary education for students demonstrating financial need.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The goal of the Pell Grant Program is to provide access to higher education to persons who might otherwise be denied access because of financial need. During FY 1986 the objectives were as follows:

- To establish rules for calculating financial need and to distribute this information to institutions and students,
- To employ an application system that does not unduly burden applicants with complex forms and unnecessary delays,
- To monitor and control inaccurate or inappropriate information leading to disbursement of awards above or below the appropriate amount, and
- To maintain an equitable distribution of aid and access to higher education for students in low-income families.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Published modified regulations governing the analysis of need and the calculation of expected family contribution for the current program year.

- Prepared and distributed Pell application forms following the published regulations from which all relevant information could be obtained with a minimum of difficulty. Studied the application/award procedures to determine the feasibility of increased automation in the Pell grant system, with the goal of reducing costs and processing time. The processing contractor handled applications from approximately 5.6 million students in academic year 1985-86 and produced eligibility reports in an effective and timely manner.

- Conducted studies of errors on applications and developed a set of procedures to identify items likely to cause inaccurate award calculation.

- Worked to ensure that the college enrollment rate of students from low-income families (income under $10,000) remained comparable with that of students from high-income families (income over $30,000), reversing a decline in low-income enrollment from 1978 to 1981 (E.1).

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope

Students Participating: Preliminary program data for academic year 1985-86 showed that a total of 5,642,081 persons applied, of which 3,712,807 were eligible (that is, the applicants did not have an expected family contribution amount exceeding the prescribed limit). In 1984-85, there were 5,514,096 applicants, of which 3,546,397 were qualified. Complete recipient and award data are not available for 1985-86, but for 1984-85 there were 2,830,804 awards totaling $3,033,314,000, for an average award of $1,071 (E.2). Undergraduate enrollment was 10.6 million (E.3), so 27 percent of all undergraduates received a Pell grant in 1984-85.

Institutions Participating: The number of institutions participating in the Pell program continued to increase slightly. Institutions acting as the disbursing agent (regular disbursement system) increased from 5,139 in academic year 1983-84 to 5,228 in 1984-85, and those requesting the Office of Student Financial Assistance to act as the disbursing agent (alternate disbursement system) were down slightly from 863 to 847 in this period (E.4).[3]

Program Effectiveness: Program data do not measure the effects of other forms of financial support (except for expected family contribution) and do not contain information on race. Other sources of data, such as the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), must be used to evaluate these factors. Although the annual CIRP survey covers only freshmen, it is very large (about 300,000 respondents) and available over a long period of time.

Table 1 shows data for first-time, full-time dependent freshmen surveyed by CIRP in academic years 1982-83 through 1985-86. These average awards are fairly comparable to those obtained from overall program data (in academic year 1982-83, the CIRP average was $887, the program average was $931; in academic year 1983-84, the CIRP average was $969, the program average was $984; in 1984-85, the CIRP average was $971 and the program average was $1,071; the final results for 1985-86 are not available). The larger value in program data shows the effect of financially independent students, who tend to receive larger Pell grants than dependent students.

The share of educational cost covered by the Pell award appears to be stabilizing. (Compare the 1984-85 overall average of 18.3 percent with the 1985-86 value of 18.2 percent.) This is the case in the individual income categories as well, the variation over the four-year period shown in the table being quite small.

Table 1

PARTICIPATION PATTERNS OF FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS IN THE PELL GRANT PROGRAM, BY FAMILY INCOME ACADEMIC YEARS 1982-83 TO 1985-86

		Family Income					
Year		Less than $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,999	$40,000+	All Income Levels
1982-83	Average award	$1,094	$881	$727	$789	$917	$887
	% aided	59.7	47.1	23.6	10.9	4.9	24.1
	% of cost	23.4	18.3	14.8	15.5	15.8	17.3
1983-84	Average award	$1,143	$990	$812	$848	$937	$969
	% aided	66.0	51.1	27.5	13.5	6.6	27.3
	% of cost	22.9	19.2	15.3	15.4	14.8	19.4
1984-85	Average award	$1,158	$995	$771	$780	$939	$971
	% aided	58.5	46.1	22.5	7.7	2.4	21.2
	% of cost	23.0	19.0	13.8	13.0	14.7	18.3
1985-86	Average award	$1,212	$1,026	$792	$834	$934	$985
	% aided	60.8	49.9	28.4	10.4	4.2	20.6
	% of cost	24.0	19.3	13.8	14.6	15.2	18.2

Key: Average award = Average dollars awarded per recipient
% aided = Number of recipients ÷ total students
% of cost = Average award ÷ average cost

Source: See E.5.

Table 1 also shows a continued decrease in 1985-86 in the percentage of students receiving Pell grants, a return to the pattern of decline interrupted in 1983-84 by an increase to 27.3 percent ("All Income Levels" column of Table 1). This percentage has gone from 26.5 (1981-82) to 24.1 (1982-83) to 27.3 (1983-84) to 21.2 (1984-85) and 20.6 (1985-86). All except the figure for 1984-85 (information from CIRP is about 5 percent less than the program) have been in agreement with program estimates for all undergraduates. Although full program data are not yet available for 1985-86, estimates of Pell participation through mid year are comparable to equivalent partial data for the previous year. The difference between CIRP and program data in the most recent year (1984-85) may be due to the increase in the independent-dependent recipient ratio and the increasing effect of proprietary schools, because CIRP concentrates on dependent students and does not survey a representative sample of proprietary schools.

An interesting fact in the distribution of Pell grant funds is the marked growth of the share taken by proprietary schools over the same 5-year period. Table 2 shows authorization amounts and number of recipients for public, private, and proprietary schools. The proprietary share nearly doubled in the period shown. The 1985-86 data are based on partial-year school reports.

Table 2

PELL GRANT DISTRIBUTION, BY INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL

Authorizations

Academic Year	Public		Private		Proprietary	
	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%
1981-82	$1,367,000,000	59.5	$622,000,000	27.1	$310,000,000	13.5
1982-83	1,374,000,000	56.8	643,000,000	26.6	400,000,000	16.6
1983-84	1,579,000,000	56.5	687,000,000	24.6	527,000,000	18.9
1984-85	1,707,000,000	56.2	699,000,000	22.9	634,000,000	20.9
1985-86*	2,027,000,000	55.6	785,000,000	21.6	831,000,000	22.8

Recipients

Academic Year	Public		Private		Proprietary	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1981-82	1,824,000	65.6	618,000	22.2	337,000	12.1
1982-83	1,626,000	63.0	567,000	22.1	386,000	14.9
1983-84	1,773,000	62.3	579,000	20.3	494,000	17.4
1984-85	1,722,000	60.9	555,000	19.6	551,000	19.1
1985-86*	1,675,000	59.4	540,000	19.2	603,000	21.4

Source: See E.4.

*Preliminary data for partial-year program operations.

Table 3 shows the distribution of Pell grants for academic year 1985-86 to freshmen by race and sex (E.5). The difference in participation rates and mean awards between men and women is not great. In general, the participation rates in all but the lowest income category were much higher for black students than for nonblack students (or for men and women as groups); grant sizes were also higher in these cases.

Table 3

PARTICIPATION IN THE PELL GRANT PROGRAM FOR FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS, BY SEX, RACE, AND FAMILY INCOME FALL 1985

	Family Income					
Participation	Under $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,999	$40,000+	Average for all Income Levels
Men						
% participating	58.3	49.5	28.8	9.9	4.1	19.1
Average per recipient	$1,234	$1,033	$798	$839	$943	$982
Women						
% participating	62.6	50.3	28.0	10.9	4.4	22.1
Average per recipient	$1,197	$1,020	$785	$829	$925	$988
[illegible]acks						
% participating	60.8	58.8	41.3	28.2	16.5	45.1
Average per recipient	$1,252	$1,138	$948	$1,096	$1,059	$1,147
Nonblacks						
% participating	61.0	48.5	27.4	9.4	3.7	18.3
Average per recipient	$1,194	$1,000	$772	$790	$912	$947

Source: See E.5.

D. Highlights of Activities

The Department of Education has revised regulations for verifying applicant data, using the results of quality control studies and external reports. The new regulations could significantly reduce fraud and abuse in the distribution of Pell grants. However, a recent study by the General Accounting Office indicates that the current verification procedures may not be cost-effective. New approaches (E.6) to the solution of the overaward/underaward problem may be needed. The Department is also pursuing an evaluation of electronic delivery capability to reduce the time to process corrections to students' applications and awards and to improve the accuracy of the procedure. This system would make it much easier to verify Pell awards.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. October school enrollment surveys, 1978 to 1983, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey.
2. "Pell Grant Management Analysis Report," U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, Division of Program Operations, for the period ending July 31, 1986.
3. "Condition of Education," 1986 edition, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
4. Program Files, August 1986, The Division of Program Operations.
5. "Annual Survey of Freshmen," Academic Years 1981-82, 1982-83, 1983-84, 1984-85, Cooperative Institutional Research Program of the Higher Education Research Institute.
6. "Report to the Honorable Paul Simon, United States Senate," General Accounting Office, GAO/PEMD-85-10, September 27, 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A major survey of student financial aid is being planned by the Center for Statistics in cooperation with the Office of Student Financial Assistance and other Federal agencies. This survey will collect data on recipients and nonrecipients of aid, providing a large sample of the student population on which detailed analysis of aid patterns can be based.

The CIRP annual freshman survey is being continued for another year but at a reduced funding level. However, the pattern of Pell grant distribution will still be observable.

A study of the requirements phase, establishing patterns of information study for a management information system, was carried out by Advanced Technology, Inc., under a contract with the Department of Education. This will provide the basis for the development of a system that may improve the operation of the program. Funding for this development is not currently allocated.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Joseph A. Vignone, (202) 472-4300

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. Includes $250 million designated for FY 1984 and a supplemental appropriation of $287 million. The total amount available for awards was $3,612,000,000.

2. Includes a supplemental appropriation of $146 million.

3. Under the regular disbursement system, the Department of Education distributes funds to the school; under the alternate disbursement system, schools certify a student's eligibility and the Department of Education distributes funds directly to the student.

SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.007)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 P.L. 89-329 (20 U.S.C. 1070b) as amended by P.L. 99-498 (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$370,000,000 1/	$355,400,000
1983	370,000,000 1/	355,400,000
1984	370,000,000 1/	375,000,000
1985	350,000,000 2/	412,500,000
1986	350,000,000 2/	394,762,000 3/

Purpose: To help needy undergraduate students meet educational expenses exceeding the amount of their expected family support. Support may include some forms of financial aid in addition to direct family contribution. Of the two types of grants under the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG) Program, initial-year (IY) grants are for students who have not previously received a SEOG, while continuing-year (CY) grants are for students who have received a SEOG before. Funding for IY grants is allocated separately from funding for CY grants, but institutions have the option of using funds from either allocation for IY or CY grants.

Funding: The Department of Education allocates SEOG funds to institutions according to a statutory formula and program regulations. Institutions distribute grants to students, each institution having the option of transferring up to 10 percent of its allocation for the SEOG program to the Work-Study Program.

Institutional Eligibility: Institutions of higher education are eligible to apply for participation in the SEOG Program. The Department of Education allocates funds to the institutions based on a conditional guaranteed minimum plus increases based on their fair share of total State and national apportionments for that year. No institution may receive less than its level of expenditure in FY 1979.

Student Eligibility: Students in participating institutions of higher education are eligible to receive a SEOG if they demonstrate financial need, are maintaining satisfactory academic progress as determined by the institution, meet citizen/resident requirements, do not owe a refund on a Title IV grant, and are not in default on a Title IV loan. Institutions allocate grants to students on the basis of financial need, subject to the availability of funds. The maximum SEOG for an academic year is $2,000 and the minimum is $200. Institutions may award up to 10 percent of their total SEOG allocation to students who are enrolled less than half-time.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- During FY 1986 the Department's principal objective for this program was to encourage institutional participation in the SEOG program, by allowing schools to apply before meeting certification requirements.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The SEOG Program has had a net increase of approximately 125 participating institutions a year (mostly proprietary) since FY 1978. In the 1985-86 academic year 4,445 institutions shared the appropriation distributed by the Department of Education.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The program staff reported that 648,582 students received grants in academic year 1983-84, the latest year for which data are complete, up from 640,652 in 1982-83. In academic year 1983-84, the average grant award amount was $557, up slightly from $535 in 1982-83 (E.1). Preliminary estimates for the program in 1984-85 indicate that the recipient and award levels changed only slightly from 1983-84. Data on first-time, full-time freshmen participants in the SEOG Program are shown in Table 1, covering the academic years from 1982-83 to 1985-86. Between academic years 1983-84 and 1985-86, participation declined from 5.90 percent to 5.31 percent, but average awards increased from $772 to $863. Table 1 shows data only for full-time freshmen, whereas program data include all classes and half-time students.

In 1983-84, although the SEOG participation rate among first-time, full-time dependent freshmen rose to its maximum value (over the past 4 years) of 7.2 percent, the average award was the lowest in this time period, $769.

Table 1

PARTICIPATION PATTERNS OF FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS IN SEOG, BY FAMILY INCOME, ACADEMIC YEARS 1982-83 TO 1985-86

		Family Income					
Academic Year		Under $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,999	$40,000+	All Income Levels
1982-83	Average Award	$768	$709	$673	$729	$816	$772
	% aided	15.1	11.0	5.7	3.0	1.1	5.9
	% of cost	16.4	14.7	13.7	14.4	14.1	14.1
1983-84	Average Award	$793	$757	$725	$780	$894	$769
	% aided	17.6	13.1	7.4	3.8	1.6	7.2
	% of cost	15.8	14.7	13.7	14.2	14.1	13.4
1984-85	Average Award	$854	$772	$775	$785	$908	$801
	% aided	13.4	11.3	6.8	3.7	1.2	5.9
	% of cost	14.5	12.3	11.3	10.9	12.7	12.4
1985-86	Average Award	$856	$839	$838	$915	$908	$863
	% aided	12.7	11.0	7.2	3.9	1.7	5.3
	% of cost	14.3	13.0	11.2	12.3	12.0	12.6

Average award = average dollars awarded per recipient
% aided = number of recipients ÷ total students
% of cost = average award ÷ average cost

Source: See E.2.

Program Effectiveness: The equity of the distribution of SEOG funds can be assessed by determining how the distribution varies with measures of ability to pay. These may be individually oriented (e.g., family income for students) or group oriented (e.g., median income or average need within a State). Ideally, funds distributed should reflect the ability to pay and the cost of education.

Although originally targeted only at the neediest students, the SEOG Program now applies to all students with any demonstrated financial need. Need analysis formulas consider income, family size, assets, unusual expenses, and sometimes other aid sources as factors in the ability to pay for education. Costs of education include tuition and fees, transportation, room and board, books, and miscellaneous expenses. Reports of fiscal operations from institutions show how the distribution of recipients and dollar amounts vary by income level. Although Table 2, which is based on the program report, uses income ranges different from those in Table 1, it shows that percentages for recipients and funds vary fairly uniformly even across the three lowest income categories.

Table 2

DISTRIBUTION OF SEOG RECIPIENTS AND FUNDS, BY FAMILY INCOME, 1983-84[4]/ AWARD YEAR

	Family Income						
Participation	Under $6,000	$ 6,000-$11,999	$12,000-$17,999	$18,000-$23,999	$24,000-$29,999	$30,000+	Independent a/ and less than half time students
% SEOG Recipients	11.9	12.5	12.7	10.9	8.9	9.5	33.6
% SEOG Funds	10.3	12.2	13.4	12.2	10.3	11.4	30.2

a/ Independent students are usually in the lowest income group.

Source: See E.1.

The average grant size (shown in Table 1) has risen, and over the past year (1984-85 to 1985-86) the fraction of cost covered by a SEOG increased slightly in the aggregate-12.4 to 12.6 percent-and in some of the individual income categories. However, it fell slightly in the lowest and middle income groups and fell from 12.7 to 12.0 percent in the highest income groups.

The 1985-86 distribution of SEOG awards to first-time, full-time students by race/ethnicity and sex is shown in Table 3. Black participation rates are higher, at all income levels, than nonblack rates of participation. Average awards also are higher except at the highest income level ($40,000+). There is less difference in participation rates and average grant sizes between men and women than between blacks and nonblacks, although women do have a lower average grant than men. The largest difference is for the lowest income group, $915 for men and $814 for women.

Table 3

PARTICIPATION IN THE SEOG PROGRAM FOR FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS, BY SEX, RACE, AND FAMILY INCOME, FALL 1985

	Family Income					
Participation	Under $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,000	$40,000+	All Income Levels
Men						
% participating	12.7	10.5	7.0	3.7	1.6	4.9
Average per recipient	$915	$867	$857	$926	$918	$889
Women						
% participating	12.8	11.4	7.4	4.1	1.7	5.7
Average per recipient	$814	$816	$819	$905	$897	$839
Blacks						
% participating	13.1	13.9	8.8	9.7	5.4	10.8
Average per recipient	$875	$917	$904	$1040	$888	$913
Nonblacks						
% participating	12.6	10.5	7.1	3.6	1.5	4.8
Average per recipient	$847	$819	$830	$890	$910	$851

Source: See E.2

According to a General Accounting Office (GAO) study of SEOG awards published in late 1985 (E.3) approximately 21 percent of SEOG recipients were dependent students reporting family income of $25,000 or more, and 23 percent of recipients reported themselves as independent students. These numbers differ slightly from those shown in Table 2 but are not seriously inconsistent. The total SEOG dollar amounts estimated by GAO showed about 24 percent to the relatively high income dependents (Table 1 gives 21.7), which is again in fair agreement.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Unpublished tables from Campus-Based Analysis Section, Fall 1985, Office of Student Financial Assistance, U.S. Department of Education, 1983-84 Campus-Based Programs.

2. Annual Survey of Freshmen 1982-83, 1983-84, 1984-85, 1985-86. Cooperative Institutional Research Program, Secondary data analysis by the Planning and Evaluation Service, Student and Institutional Aid Division.

3. "Information on the Distribution of SEOG Funds to Students". General Accounting Office, GAO/PEMD-86-01BR, November 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A major survey of student financial aid is being planned by the Center for Statistics in cooperation with the Office of Student Financial Assistance and other Federal agencies. This survey will collect data on recipients and nonrecipients of aid, providing a large sample of the student population on which detailed analyses of aid patterns can be based. A pilot survey has been made and the results are being reviewed.

The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) annual freshman survey is being supplemented with a followup study of students 2 and 4 years after their freshman year. This study should provide valuable data on dropout patterns for various levels of undergraduate education and on the differences between freshmen and higher-level undergraduates in the pattern of aid receipt.

A study of the data definition phase of a management information system has been carried out by Advanced Technology, Inc., under a contract with the Department's Information Resources Management Service (IRMS). This will provide the basis for the development of a system that may improve the operation and evaluation of the program. Funding for this operation has not been allocated.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Paul Z. Hill, (202) 245-9717

Program Studies : Jay Noell (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. P.L. 92-35, Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981.

2. Authorization for this additional year beyond the statutory expiration in FY 1986 is provided by General Education Provision Act legislation.

3. After sequestration.

4. This is a revised and improved version of the data in the FY 1985 Annual Evaluation Report. The data for 1984-85 are not available.

STATE STUDENT INCENTIVE GRANTS
(CFDA No. 84.069)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Section 415A to 415D, P.L. 92-318, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1070c to 1070C-3) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$100,000,000	$73,680,000
1983	150,000,000	60,000,000
1984	200,000,000	76,000,000
1985	250,000,000	76,000,000
1986	250,000,000	72,732,000

Purpose: To help States develop and expand grant assistance to students attending postsecondary educational institutions.

State Eligibility: All States are eligible to receive Federal formula grants, which must be matched with at least equal funds from State resources. State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) agencies encourage States to develop additional sources of grant assistance to needy students in postsecondary education. In 31 States, Federal SSIG funds are overmatched by at least three to one. In 12 of the remaining States, SSIGs account for 50 percent of State grant assistance.

Student Eligibility: To be eligible for one of these grants, an undergraduate must be attending a public school, a private, or non profit school, or (at State option) a proprietary school; must meet citizen or resident requirements; and must not owe a refund on a Title IV grant or be in default on a Title IV loan. At State option, graduate and less-than-half-time students may also be eligible. All non profit institutions are eligible to participate, unless they are excluded by the State constitution or by a State law enacted prior to October 1978.

Administrative Agencies: Under Section 1203 of the Higher Education Act, each State designates an agency to be responsible for these funds. It may be part of the State government, the Education Department or a division dealing with higher education, the organization managing other State grant or loan programs, or a designated corporation acting for the State. The agency receives Federal SSIG funds, matches them at least dollar for dollar with State funds, and distributes them to students eligible for the State student aid program.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response TO GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- The continuing objective of this program in FY 1986 was to encourage States to increase support of grant programs for needy students.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The total State need-based grant support, including overmatching of SSIG funds, increased from $1,080,838,000 in program year 1983-84 to $1,170,884,000 in 1984-85. Federal SSIG allotments represent about 6 percent of the overall State need-based grant effort. In 13 States that did not have grant programs before SSIG, State funds now provide more than a 50-50 match of the Federal allotment. All States now participate in the SSIG program.[1]

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In program year 1985-86, Federal funds of $76 million, matched by the states for a total of $152 million, were distributed to approximately 304,000 recipients, with awards averaging $500. Over $1.3 billion in need-based grants was distributed by States. The average award for all State grants in the 1985-86 academic year was $914. SSIG accounted for about 6 percent of all 1985-86 State aid dollars (E.1).

Table 1 shows that in the 1984-85 program year, public 4-year institutions received 42 percent of Federal SSIG funds and accounted for 52 percent of all recipients. Private 4-year institutions received 42 percent of Federal SSIG funds but had only 27 percent of all recipients. Two-year and proprietary institutions accounted for the remaining 16 percent of funds and 21 percent of recipients.

Table 1

SSIG DISTRIBUTION FOR SELECTED PROGRAM YEARS

	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
Average student award (includes State match)	$556	$545	$528	$577	$594
Percentage of all SSIG recipients at:					
4-year public institutions	49.3	53.2	51.8	50.5	51.8
4-year private institutions	32.8	25.1	24.1	29.6	26.8
Proprietary	2.0	1.7	2.1	2.1	2.8
2-year institutions	16.0	20.0	21.9	17.8	18.6
Percentage of all Federal SSIG funds at:					
4-year public institutions	39.5	43.6	43.1	41.0	41.7
4-year private institutions	45.3	39.9	36.5	43.4	42.2
Proprietary	2.5	2.1	2.4	2.0	3.2
2-year institutions	12.7	14.5	18.0	13.7	12.8
Percentage of SSIG Recipients with family incomes of $20,000+	17.9	18.2	19.4	23.0	24.2

Source: E.2

Program Effectiveness: SSIG data through the 1984-85 program year indicate that the size of the average SSIG award declined from $556 in 1980-81 to $545 in 1981-82 and $528 in 1982-83, and then increased to $594 in 1984-85. The percentage of all awards, made to students from families with incomes over $20,000, increased steadily from 17.9 to 24.2 percent, probably because of wage inflation. Information on the distribution of all State grants (including SSIG funds) for first-time, full-time students (Table 2) reflects a similar trend of increasing average award levels. However, the percentage of costs covered by State grants decreased over this period, possibly because of high inflation of college costs. This was true for first-time, full-time dependent students from all income levels except the highest from 1982-83 to 1985-86.

Table 2

PARTICIPATION PATTERNS OF FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS IN STATE GRANT PROGRAMS,1/ BY FAMILY INCOME, FALL 1981 to 1984

		Family Income					
Academic Year		UNDER $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,999	$40,000+	Average for all Income Groups
1982-83	Average award	$789	$704	$678	$735	$725	$718
	% aided	28.2	25.2	17.7	10.7	5.9	15.6
	% of cost	16.8	14.6	13.8	14.5	12.5	14.0
1983-84	Average award	$834	$780	$736	$821	$831	$789
	% aided	29.2	27.3	19.3	11.9	7.2	17.0
	% of cost	16.6	15.1	13.9	15.0	13.1	14.1
1984-85	Average award	$867	$812	$750	$752	$973	$793
	% aided	25.9	25.5	18.6	11.1	6.6	15.4
	% of cost	14.9	13.5	11.9	11.7	12.3	12.9
1985-86	Average award	$892	$856	$833	$900	$900	$872
	% aided	27.9	26.4	21.0	13.0	7.8	15.4
	% of cost	15.5	14.0	12.4	13.5	13.4	13.6

Source: See E.3.

Average award = average dollars awarded per recipient
% aided = number of recipients ÷ total students
% of cost = average Award ÷ average cost

Table 1 indicates little change in the distribution of SSIG award funds to public colleges, while Table 2 suggests that, except for 1983-84, the relative number of first-time, full-time freshmen aided by the program has remained roughly at a level of one in six.

Finally, despite the fact that SSIG program funding has remained essentially the same over the FY 1982 to FY 1986 period, need-based State grant programs as a whole have risen from $908 million in 1982-83 to $1,311 million in 1985-86, an increase of 44 percent (E.1). Overall State funding for higher education during this period increased 16 percent (E.4). This reflects an increasing responsibility and willingness of the States to fund student aid programs.

Table 3

PARTICIPATION IN STATE GRANTS[1] FOR FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS, FALL 1985, BY SEX, RACE, AND FAMILY INCOME

	Family Income					
Participation	UNDER $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,999	$40,000+	Average for all Income Groups
Men						
% participating	27.0	25.9	19.8	11.8	7.0	14.0
Average per recipient	$960	$912	$839	$955	$944	$914
Women						
% participating	28.5	26.8	22.1	14.3	8.8	16.8
Average per recipient	$845	$808	$827	$859	$861	$837
Blacks						
% participating	23.2	21.9	19.7	17.9	12.9	19.8
Average per recipient	$815	$831	$908	$1033	$978	$879
Nonblacks						
% participating	30.2	27.2	21.1	12.8	7.7	15.0
Average per recipient	$919	$858	$827	$890	$896	$872

Source: See E.1.

Table 3 shows the distribution of State grants to first-time, full-time dependent freshmen by race, sex, and family income for the fall of 1985. It indicates that women have slightly higher participation rates and lower average awards in all income groups.

Overall black participation in State grant programs is higher than non black participation, and the average awards for the two groups are almost the same: $879 for blacks and $872 for nonblack students. At the two higher income levels, black students participate at a greater rate than nonblack students, while at the three lower levels the reverse is true. The high overall rate for blacks is due to their high participation rates in the lower income groups, which contain the majority of black students. However, most of the nonblack students are in the higher income classes and have low participation rates, so the overall rate is depressed below that for blacks.

D. Highlights of Activities

Project-monitoring activities for this program included audits performed in accordance with OMB Circular A-102. As a result of the Single Audit Act of 1984, OMB Circular A-128 was used for audits performed for FY 1986.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. K. Reeher and J. Davis, National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs, 17th Annual Survey Report, 1985-86 Academic Year, January 1986.

2. State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) Data Summary Reports, SSIG Program Files, Division of Policy and Program Development, Office of Student Financial Assistance, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, 1986.

3. Annual Survey of Freshmen 1981-82 through 1985-86, Cooperative Institutional Research Programs of the Higher Education Research Institute, Unpublished tables derived by the Planning and Evaluation Service of the Department of Education, 1986.

4. M.M. Chambers, "Appropriation of State Tax Funds for Operating Expenses penses of Higher Education", National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of the SSIG program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Neil C. Nelson, (202) 245-9720

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. State grants include Federal SSIG allotments plus required State matching funds and, in many cases, an overmatch from State funds.

GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.032)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title IV-B, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1071-1087-3a) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982:

Fiscal Year	Loan Volume	Obligations	Appropriation
1982	$6,238,000	$3,005,000	$3,074,000
1983	6,928,000	2,631,000	3,101,000
1984	7,916,000	3,128,000	2,257,000
1985	8,884,000	4,082,000	3,800,000
1986(est)	8,156,000	3,754,000	3,300,000

Purpose: To facilitate students' access to postsecondary education and to enhance their choices among a broader range of institutions. The Guaranteed Student Loan Program (GSLP) authorizes low-interest loans to students to help pay students' costs of attending eligible postsecondary institutions, including colleges and universities; vocational, technical, business, and trade schools; and certain foreign institutions.

Parent Loans for Undergraduate Students (PLUS) serve the same general purpose as GSLP loans. PLUS makes loans to parents of dependent undergraduates and to graduate and independent undergraduate students. These loans are less subsidized than regular GSLP loans, and repayment begins within 60 days of the loan disbursement.

Eligibility: U.S. citizens, nationals, and permanent residents in the United States for other than a temporary purpose may apply for a GSL if they are enrolled or accepted for enrollment on at least a half-time basis as undergraduate, graduate, professional, or vocational students at a participating postsecondary school. A student who is already enrolled at a participating institution must maintain satisfactory progress. Also, the student must not owe a refund on a Title IV grant or be in default on a Title IV loan. Until October 17, 1986, if the student's or the family's adjusted gross income exceeded $30,000, the student or family must undergo a needs test to determine eligibility for Federal payment of interest on the student's behalf while the student is in school. After that date, all students (and, if applicable, their families) must complete a needs test.

PLUS: Parents and eligible students generally can obtain loans on the same basis as parents and students borrowing under regular GSLP provisions. An important exception is that there is no needs test, although lenders may restrict loans or loan amounts according to the borrower's creditworthiness.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response TO GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal operating objectives for this program were as follows:

- To develop and have published in the Federal Register a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) on the GSLP and PLUS programs.
- To develop procedures, in conjunction with the Internal Revenue Service, to offset Federal income tax refunds for borrowers who are in default on their loans.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department of Education developed and published in the Federal Register on September 4, 1985, a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for both the GSL and PLUS programs. Comments have been incorporated into a draft final regulation to be published in the Federal Register during the fall of 1986.
- The Department of Education assisted the Internal Revenue Service in making deductions from income tax refunds for borrowers who have defaulted on their loans. Approximately $89 million was collected from GSL/PLUS defaulters.

C. Costs and Benefits

Student Participation: The Department of Education estimates that about 30 percent of all eligible students participate in the GSLP. For full-time freshmen undergraduates for the fall of 1985, the participation rate was 25.3 percent (see Table 1).

During recent years, the Department has applied a needs test to loan applicants from families with adjusted gross income of $30,000 and above. Over all participation rates rose from 22.4 percent in academic year 1982-83 to 26.2 percent in 1984-85, but dropped to 25.3 percent in 1985-86. There is currently no needs test for borrowers with family incomes of less than $30,000. Participation rates for this group continued to increase between academic years 1982-83 and 1985-86. For example, families in the lowest income category (less than $10,000), 24.0 percent borrowed in 1982-83 and 26.6 percent borrowed in 1985-86. Participation by students in the highest income category--those most affected by the needs analysis restriction--was only 11.8 percent in 1982-83 but had increased to 16.1 percent by 1985-86.

Table 1

GSL PARTICIPATION PATTERNS OF FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME, DEPENDENT STUDENTS OF DIFFERING INCOME LEVELS, ACADEMIC YEARS 1982-83 to 1985-86

		Family Income					
Academic Year		Under $10,000	$10,000- $19,999	$20,000- $29,999	$30,000- $39,999	$40,000+	Average for All Recipients
1982-83	Average Award a/	$1,636	$1,704	$1,833	$1,782	$1,830	$1,771
	% aided b/	24.0	27.6	27.6	23.5	11.8	22.4
	% of cost c/	34.9	35.4	37.4	35.1	31.6	34.5
1983-84	Average Award	$1,631	$1,740	$1,841	$1,817	$1,846	$1,791
	% aided	25.4	27.8	29.3	25.3	13.0	23.4
	% of cost	32.5	33.7	34.8	33.0	29.1	31.7
1984-85	Average Award	$1,772	$1,866	$1,950	$1,962	$1,970	$1,919
	% aided	28.9	31.6	33.2	28.8	15.3	26.2
	% of cost	30.9	31.7	32.8	31.0	28.1	31.1
1985-86	Average Award	$1,778	$1,875	$1,959	$1,968	$1,948	$1,929
	% aided	26.6	32.1	34.4	30.3	16.1	25.3
	% of cost	30.2	31.7	31.8	30.7	27.1	30.2

a/ Average award = average dollars awarded per recipient.
b/ % aided = number of recipients ÷ total students.
c/ % of cost = average award ÷ average cost.

Source: See E.1.

Program Scope:

GSLP: The Department of Education estimates that loan volume under GSLP totaled about $7.7 billion in FY 1986, compared with $8.4 billion in FY 1985 and $7.5 billion in FY 1984 (see Table 2). In FY 1986, 3.2 million students received these loans, compared with 3.6 million students in FY 1985 and almost 3.3 million in FY 1984.

PLUS: The Department of Education estimates that FY 1986 PLUS loans totaled $504 million, whereas this component of the program was $512 million in FY 1985 and $369 million in FY 1984. There were approximately 191,000 participants in the PLUS program in FY 1986, 192,000 in FY 1985, and some 140,000 in FY 1984.

Combined Program: FY 1986 loan volume for GSLP and PLUS combined is estimated to be about $8.2 billion, compared with about $8.9 billion in FY 1985 and $7.9 billion in FY 1984. Total cumulative loans outstanding is estimated to be $39.1 billion in FY 1986, compared with $36.8 billion in FY 1985 and $31.9 billion in FY 1984.

Table 2

SUMMARY OF LOAN VOLUME AND NUMBERS OF RECIPIENTS, FISCAL YEARS 1983-86

	FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986
GSLP Loans				
Loan volume (millions)	$6,671	$7,547	$8,372	$7,652
Recipients (thousands)	2,939	3,263	3,631	3,242
Average loan	$2,269	$2,313	$2,305	$2,323
PLUS Loans				
Loan volume (millions)	$ 257	$ 369	$ 512	$ 504
Recipients (thousands)	100	140	192	191
Average loan	$2,571	$2,632	$2,698	$2,699
Total				
Loan volume (millions)	$6,928	$7,916	$8,884	$8,156
Recipients (thousands)	3,039	3,403	3,426	3,343
Average loan	$2,238	$2,279	$2,314	$2,344
Total Cumulative Outstanding				
Loan volume (millions)	$26,969	$31,904	$36,825	$39,100

SOURCE: See E.2 below.

Program Effectiveness: The average amount borrowed has increased moderately steadily in most income categories, in line with increasing education costs. The average loan for all borrowers was $2,238 in FY 1983 but had increased to $2,344 by FY 1986 (see Table 2). The average loan to first-time, full-time dependent Freshmen for FY 1986 was $1929, or, $415 less than the average for all borrowers (see Table 1). Among Freshmen, average loan size increased most for borrowers with family incomes of $30-$39,000. In the period between FY 1983 and FY 1986 the average loan for this group increased from $1782 to $1968, an average annual increase of approximately 3 percent.

Guaranteed student loans covered a smaller percentage of the total cost of education in academic year 1985-86 than in earlier years. For students in the lowest income groups (below $10,000), the average loan amount decreased from 34.9 percent of total cost in 1982-83 to 30.2 percent in 1985-86. Most other income groups experienced similar decreases. For all borrowers, guaranteed loans amounted to 34.5 percent of total cost in 1982-83 but gradually decreased to 30.2 percent in 1985-86.

Among Freshmen, men and women used guaranteed student loans about equally (see Table 3). On average, they also borrowed nearly equal amounts. Women from families with incomes of less than $10,000 tended to use loans slightly less than men. Those having family incomes of more than $40,000 used the loans at a slightly higher rate than men. Overall, blacks used guaranteed loans less than non blacks. In the two lowest family income categories, blacks took out the loans at a significantly lower rate than non blacks; for example, in the under-$10,000 income category, 18.6 percent of blacks participated the GSLP, compared with 30.4 percent for non blacks.

Table 3

PARTICIPATION IN THE GSL PROGRAM FOR FIRST-TIME,
FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS,
BY SEX, RACE, AND FAMILY INCOME, FALL 1985

	Family Income					
Participation	Under $10,000	$10,000 $19,999	$20,000 $29,999	$30,000 $39,999	$40,000+	Average for All Recipients
Men						
% participating	28.8	32.6	34.4	29.8	15.8	25.1
Average per recipient	$1,785	$1,874	$1,947	$1,981	$1,935	$1,928
Women						
% participating	25.0	31.6	34.3	30.8	16.5	25.6
Average per recipient	$1,772	$1,875	$1,971	$1,956	$1,963	$1,930
Black						
% participating	18.6	23.1	30.6	29.6	22.2	23.6
Average per recipient	$1,652	$1,705	$1,887	$1,936	$1,836	$1,788
Non blacks						
% participating	30.4	33.8	34.8	30.4	15.9	25.6
Average per recipient	$1,813	$1,897	$1,965	$1,971	$1,955	$1,941

Source: See E.1.

D. Highlights of Activities

The Department of Education continued to increase its efforts to collect on outstanding defaults and to reduce the incidence of default in FY 1986. The Department plans for FY 1987 include the following:

- To issue updated regulations reflecting reauthorization changes and to have the Department's debt collection proposals enacted.
- To commit a considerable amount of time and effort to make final the NPRM on GSL collections and to issue a final rule.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), University of California at Los Angeles, California, 1986.
2. Program Files. Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1982-85.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

One study is in progress, another is planned:

- The CIRP survey referred to in Section II E.1 provides annual data on distribution of aid from Federal student aid programs for first-time, full-time freshmen. Data for the 1986-87 academic year will be available in the summer of 1987.
- The Department began the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study during 1986. The field test has been completed and the survey of undergraduate and graduate students, their parents, and institutions will be conducted during 1987.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Carol Roberts, (202) 245-2475

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. All volume figures represent commitments rather than disbursements.
2. Represents total obligations incurred. Amounts have not been adjusted to reflect program receipts (collections on defaulted loans, insurance premiums, etc.).

DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.038)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title IV, Part E, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1087aa-1087ii) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$286,000,000	$193,360,000
1983	286,000,000	193,360,000
1984	286,000,000	180,860,000
1985	625,000,000	215,000,000
1986	625,000,000[1]	208,626,000[2]

Purpose: To help institutions make low-interest loans to financially needy students to help pay their costs of attending postsecondary educational institutions. The Direct Loan Program is the loan component of the campus-based programs that are directly administered by financial aid administrators at postsecondary institutions. Direct Loans provide flexibility to financial aid administrators in packaging student aid awards to meet the individual needs of students.

Eligibility: Postsecondary institutions meeting eligibility requirements may participate. The Department of Education establishes an institutional revolving fund financed from repayment of previous loans, an institutional match, and the annual Federal Capital Contribution appropriated by Congress. The Department allocates appropriated funds to the States according to a statutory formula, and then to institutions according to both statutory requirements and program regulations.

If the Direct Loan Program appropriation exceeds the FY 1981 appropriation of $186 million, the State allotment formula uses the ratio of full-time enrollees in institutions of higher education within the State to the total number of such persons enrolled in all the States for 90 percent of funding. If additional funds are available, the Department apportions then to a State to make its amount equal to the amount received for FY 1972.

Students are eligible for a loan if (1) they are enrolled on at least a half-time basis and are making satisfactory academic progress as determined by the institutions or (2) they have been accepted for enrollment for at least half-time at an eligible institution, are U.S. citizens or are in the U.S. for other than a temporary purpose and intend to become permanent residents, do not owe a refund on a Title IV grant, and are not in default on a Title IV loan. Direct Loan applicants must demonstrate financial need as determined by one of the approved systems to analyze need.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department of Education's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To increase collections of defaulted loans assigned to the Department by institutions and
- To encourage institutions to collect loans more effectively and thus make more funds available to students.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Institutions turned over to the Department of Education more defaulted loans for collection, and collections of defaulted loans have subsequently increased: in FY 1985, private agencies under contract to the Department collected $36.3 million in defaulted loans.
- The Department strengthened the due-diligence requirements that institutions must meet in carrying out their collection activities.
- Two modifications were made to the payment system by which loan forgiveness is granted to certain teachers. These changes assure that only eligible institutions will receive funds.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1984, Direct Loan volume totaled $682 million; there were 718,588 borrowers. The Department of Education allocated the FY 1985 Federal Capital Contribution of $160.5 million among the 3,342 participating institutions. Private universities and 4-year institutions received 44 percent ($69.9 million), while private 2-year colleges received 3 percent ($4.2 million). Public universities and 4-year institutions received 33 percent ($52.5 million), and public 2-year colleges, 6 percent ($9.4 million). Borrowers attending proprietary schools received about 14 percent ($24.4 million) (see E.1).

Student Participation: During academic year 1985-86, about 6.6 percent of all first-time, full-time freshmen participated in the Direct Loan Program, compared with about 7.0 percent in 1984-85. Participation rates generally vary with family income: the higher the family income, the lower the participation rate (see Table 1). In 1985-86, for example, participation rates were highest (9.8 and 11.0 percent) for persons in the two lowest family income categories (under $10,000 and $10,000-$19,999) and lowest (3.2 percent) for percent in the highest family income group ($40,000+). This pattern has been consistent for many years.

First-time, full-time freshmen borrowed an average of $1,259 under the Direct Loan Program during the most recent year. The lowest-income borrowers (under $10,000) had loans averaging $1,152, while borrowers from the highest-income category ($40,000+) had an average loan of $1,390. This difference is explained primarily by the fact that higher-income borrowers attend high-cost institutions more frequently than do lower-income borrowers.

Table 1

PARTICIPATION PATTERNS OF FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME, DEPENDENT STUDENTS IN THE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM, BY FAMILY INCOME, ACADEMIC YEARS 1982-83 TO 1985-86

		Family Income					
Academic Year		Under $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,999	$40,000+	Average for all Recipients
1982-83	Average Award a/	$973	$1,084	$1,166	$1,219	$1,354	$1,138
	% aided b/	10.0	10.7	8.4	5.4	2.0	6.7
	% of cost c/	20.8	22.5	23.8	24.0	23.4	22.2
1983-84	Average Award	$1,027	$1,086	$1,179	$1,260	$1,347	$1,158
	% aided	11.5	11.3	9.2	6.4	2.5	7.4
	% of cost	20.4	21.0	22.3	22.8	21.2	19.6
1984-85	Average Award	$1,064	$1,173	$1,269	$1,329	$1,426	$1,238
	% aided	10.7	10.7	9.6	6.2	2.3	7.0
	% of cost	17.1	18.6	20.0	19.9	20.3	19.2
1985-86	Average Award	$1,152	$1,166	$1,248	$1,311	$1,390	$1,259
	% aided	9.8	11.0	9.5	6.6	3.2	6.6
	% of cost	18.6	18.0	18.0	18.4	17.6	18.1

Source: See E.2.

a/ Average award = average dollars awarded per recipient.
b/ % aided = number of recipients ÷ total students.
c/ % of cost = average award ÷ average cost.

Program Effectiveness: One measure of program effectiveness is the extent to which Direct Loans met total college costs during the most recent period compared with previous periods.

Student aid awards have covered a smaller percentage of total cost during recent years, principally because of rapidly rising tuition. During academic year 1985-86, for example, the average Direct Loan met 18.1 percent of the total cost for first-time, full-time freshmen, whereas in 1984-85, the average Direct Loan met 19.2 percent of cost. Consistent with the pattern of previous years, the Direct Loan percentage of total cost shows little variation across family income categories. For example, an average Direct Loan met 18.6 percent of total cost for students from families having incomes of under $10,000 and 17.6 percent of total cost for students with family incomes of $40,000 or more.

Whereas Table 1 shows the distribution of Direct Loans to full-time freshmen with different family incomes and costs of education as well as the average loan amount and the percentage of total cost met by these loans, Table 2 provides the distribution to students by family income, race, and sex. The data indicate that women as a whole had higher rates of participation but their loan amounts were about the same as those for men. Greater proportions of blacks than whites borrowed, but the blacks borrowed substantially larger amounts.

Table 2

PARTICIPATION IN THE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM
FOR FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS,
BY SEX, RACE, AND FAMILY INCOME, FALL 1985

	Family Income					
Participation	Under $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,000	$40,000+	Average for all Recipients
Men						
% participating	10.5	9.9	9.1	5.8	2.3	6.5
Average per recipient	$1,058	$1,153	$1,261	$1,328	$1,402	$1,234
Women						
% participating	10.9	11.5	10.2	6.7	2.4	7.7
Average per recipient	$1,068	$1,188	$1,276	$1,329	$1,452	$1,242
Blacks						
% participating	9.8	10.5	11.6	6.6	3.7	9.2
Average per recipient	$1,058	$1,212	$1,134	$1,104	$ 875	$1,081
Nonblacks						
% participating	11.0	10.9	9.5	6.2	2.3	6.9
Average per recipient	$1,169	$1,294	$1,186	$ 851	$ 434	$ 812

Source: See E.2.

D. Highlights of Activities

Efforts are being increased to reduce outstanding defaults in the Direct Loan Program by strengthening institutional due-diligence requirements and by intensifying collection activities. These efforts, if successful, will result in the availability of more funds for additional loans.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1982-1985.

2. The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), University of California at Los Angeles, California, 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

One study is in progress and another is planned:

- The CIRP survey referred to in E.2 was repeated in the fall of 1986. It includes annual data on distribution of aid from Federal student aid programs for first-time, full-time freshmen by race and sex. The report will be ready in the spring of 1987.
- The Department will be implementing the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study during the winter of 1986. The study will survey undergraduate and graduate students, their parents, and institutions.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Paul Z. Hill, (202) 245-9717

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. Authorization for this additional year beyond the statutory expiration in FY 1985 is provided by General Education Provision Act legislation.

2. After sequestration.

WORK-STUDY PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.033)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title IV, Part C, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (42 U.S.C. 2751-2756b) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$550,000,000	$528,000,000
1983	590,000,000	590,000,000
1984	555,000,000	555,000,000
1985	830,000,000	592,500,000
1986	830,000,000[1]	567,023,000[2]

Purpose: To stimulate and promote part-time employment for postsecondary students who need the earnings to help meet the cost of their education. Federal grants to institutions are used to subsidize up to 80 percent of a student's wages. The remainder is provided by the employer, which may be the institution itself, if it is a nonprofit institution.

Authorization for the Work-Study Program also provides for job location and development projects for part-time, off-campus employment. Up to 10 percent of the Work-Study grant, not to exceed $25,000, may be used to support these projects.

Eligibility: Most public or nonprofit institutions or organizations may participate as employers. Funds are allotted among the States according to a statutory formula and then allocated to institutions under both statutory requirements and program regulations.

Undergraduate, graduate, or professional students (enrolled or accepted for enrollment as regular students) who are maintaining satisfactory academic progress in accordance with the standards and practices of the institution are eligible to participate in the program. They must demonstrate financial need as determined by the institution using an approved need analysis system. They must not owe a refund on a Title IV grant, must not be in default on a Title IV loan, and must meet citizen/resident requirements. The minimum-wage law applies.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response TO GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

During FY 1986, the Department of Education sought to promote identification of Work Study positions related to students' career goals.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Approximately 440 institutions had established job location and development projects during the 1983-84 school year.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: During FY 1985, approximately $645 million in Federal Work-Study funds went to students. These funds provided jobs for 735,456 students. Funds to institutions were awarded as follows:

Institution	Percent
Public, 4-year	40.4
Private, 4-year	40.8
Public, 2-year	15.5
Private, 2-year	1.9
Proprietary	1.4
	100.0

Program data indicate that 3,557 postsecondary institutions participated in the Federal Work-Study Program during academic year 1985-86.

In FY 1984, 440 postsecondary institutions participated in job location and development centers that assisted 185,609 students. These centers provided about $313.6 million in total compensation to these students.

In the fall of 1984, a Higher Education Panel Survey found that 2,592 of 2,650 institutions of higher education (98 percent) received Work-Study funds from the Federal Government. More than 775 institutions (29 percent) received such funds from States; 235 of these institutions also received Work-Study funds from other sources. Of the 58 institutions not participating in the Federal Work-Study Program, 53 were private 2-year colleges (see E.1).

Student Participation: During FY 1985, about 11 percent of all first-time, full-time freshmen participated in the Work-Study Program (see Table 1). The corresponding participation rate in 1982-83 had been about 13 percent. Rates vary widely, however, by family income. In 1985-86, for example, participation rates were highest (20.9 percent) for persons in the lowest family income category (under $10,000) and lowest (4.9 percent) for those in the highest family income group ($40,000+). This pattern has remained consistent for many years. Work-Study participants received an average of $802 during 1985-86.

The average Work-Study award also appears to be strongly related to family income. In 1985-86 for example, participants with family incomes of $40,000+ received awards that were about $145 higher than the average for those with family incomes of less than $10,000 (see Table 1). The principal reason is that many students from higher-income families attend more expensive colleges and thus are eligible for larger amounts of aid. Many of these Work-Study awards amounted to a small percentage of the total cost of the student's education.

Table 1

PARTICIPATION PATTERNS OF FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS IN THE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM, BY FAMILY INCOME ACADEMIC YEARS 1982-83 TO 1985-86

Academic Year		Family Income					
		Under $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,999	$40,000+	Average for All Recipients
1982-83	Average Award a/	$685	$702	$738	$753	$782	$725
	% aided b/	21.9	19.3	14.7	10.2	4.6	12.8
	% of cost c/	14.6	14.6	15.0	14.8	13.5	14.1
1983-84	Average Award	$720	$758	$764	$790	$809	$764
	% aided	25.2	22.1	16.6	11.8	5.4	14.4
	% of cost	14.3	14.7	14.4	14.3	12.8	13.3
1984-85	Average Award	$752	$758	$747	$748	$831	$760
	% aided	19.5	17.0	13.5	8.4	3.4	10.7
	% of cost	13.2	12.5	11.4	9.8	10.2	11.7
1985-86	Average Award	$728	$793	$790	$819	$873	$802
	% aided	20.9	19.1	15.6	10.2	4.9	11.1
	% of cost	12.8	13.1	11.5	10.6	10.2	11.7

Source: See E.3.

a/ Average award = average dollars per recipient.
b/ % aided = number of recipients/total students.
c/ % of cost = (average award ÷ average cost).

Table 2 summarizes the distribution of Work-Study recipients by family income, sex, and race. Overall, the participation rate for women exceeds the rate for men by more than three percentage points, and the rate for blacks exceeds the rate for non blacks by more than eight percentage points. These differences vary, of course, by family income categories.

Table 2

PARTICIPATION IN THE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM FOR FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS BY SEX, RACE, AND FAMILY INCOME
FALL 1985

	Family Income					
Participation	Under $10,000	$10,000-$19,999	$20,000-$29,999	$30,000-$39,999	$40,000+	Average for all Recipients
Men						
% participating	18.9	16.9	13.7	8.9	4.2	9.5
Average per recipient	$760	$834	$801	$830	$920	$831
Women						
% participating	22.3	21.0	17.6	11.6	5.7	12.8
Average per recipient	$708	$764	$780	$811	$835	$780
Blacks						
% participating	23.1	21.1	18.5	16.2	10.4	18.7
Average per recipient	$614	$715	$747	$916	$827	$718
Nonblacks						
% participating	19.9	18.8	15.4	9.9	4.7	10.4
Average per recipient	$786	$810	$794	$812	$878	$816

Source: See E.3.

Program Effectiveness: Program effectiveness is measured partly by the scope of work opportunities provided. A recent Higher Education Panel Study found that 98 percent of the 2,650 institutions of higher education with a Work-Study program also received Federal funds. The Work-Study funds accounted for more than three-quarters of all funds in 47 percent of the schools and for between one-quarter and three-quarters in 45 percent of the other schools. Although additional funds were available from State and institutional sources, neither of these sources was as important as the Federal program for creating work opportunities (see E.3).

As Table 1 shows, Student Work-Study aid awards have covered a smaller percentage of the total cost of postsecondary education during recent years, principally because of rapidly rising tuition. In academic year 1985-86, for example, the average award met 11.7 percent of total cost for first-time, full-time freshmen. In 1982-83, the average award had met 14.1 percent of cost. Consistent with the pattern of previous years, the percentage of total cost shows minor variation across family income categories. For example, an average award met 12.8 percent of total cost for students with family incomes of less than $10,000 and 10.2 percent for those in the $40,000+ group.

D. Highlights of Activities

In addition to providing work opportunities for students, the program encourages use of funds to support programs for adult literacy and employment at eligible day-care centers. The program also strengthens the relationship between academic programs and work experiences through the Cooperative Education Program (CFDA No. 84.055).

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. "Student Financial Aid for Full-Time Undergraduates" HEP Survey No. 68, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1985.

2. "The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP)" University of California at Los Angeles, California, 1986.

3. "Student Financial Aid, Fall 1984" HEP Survey No. 68, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The CIRP survey referred to in E.2 provides annual data on the distribution of aid from Federal student aid programs for first-time, full-time freshmen. Data for the 1985-86 academic year will be available in the spring of 1987.

The Department began the National Postsecondary Student Aid Survey during 1986. The field test has been completed and the survey of undergraduate and graduate students, their parents, and institutions will be conducted during 1987.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Paul Z. Hill, (202) 245-9717

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. Authorization for this additional year beyond the statutory expiration in FY 1985 is provided by General Education Provision Act legislation.

2. After sequestration.

UPWARD BOUND
(CFDA No. 84.047)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title IV, Sections 417A and 417C, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1a) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation 1/	Allocation1/
1982	$165,000,000	$150,240,000	$63,720,000
1983	170,000,000	154,740,000	68,366,514
1984	170,000,000	164,740,000	70,754,376
1985	Indefinite	174,940,000	73,614,193
1986	Indefinite	168,786,000	72,338,636

Purpose: To generate among low-income youths and potential first-generation college students the skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school. The goal of the program is to increase the academic performance and motivation of eligible enrollees so that they may complete secondary school and successfully pursue postsecondary education programs.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives for the Upward Bound program were as follows:

- To provide technical assistance to prospective applicants for new Upward Bound grant awards by conducting application preparation workshops and developing and disseminating an application development guide;
- To continue implementing the recommendations of the General Accounting Office (GAO) on assessing the success of Upward Bound projects in meeting two important program goals: increasing participants' academic skills and enabling participants to be successful in postsecondary education;
- To establish procedures to allow the Department to assess changes in project performance over time and to assess overall program accomplishments; and
- To carry out the new application competition.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Five application preparation workshops were held for prospective Upward Bound applicants, and an application development guide was prepared and sent to all persons who requested a program grant application form.

- In response to the GAO recommendations the Department ensured that every Upward Bound application funded in FY 1986 contained objectives for measuring the academic skills growth of Upward Bound participants and for following up on Upward Bound graduates to determine their postsecondary success. The applicant guide emphasized the need to adhere to these recommendations.

- The Department implemented new, cost-effective grant-monitoring procedures for annual performance reporting.

- A total of 564 applications for new grants were received and reviewed; 400 grants were awarded.

C. Costs and Benefits

Types of Benefits: The Department of Education makes grants to participating institutions and agencies to provide educational services to disadvantaged youths. Student benefits typically begin with a 6-week residency and study on a college or secondary school campus. During the academic year, the students attend Saturday classes or tutorial/counseling sessions or participate in cultural enrichment activities. During their junior and senior years of high school, the students explore postsecondary options.

Program Scope: In FY 1986, 400 awards were made for a total amount of $72,338,636. About 30,000 participants were served at an average Federal cost of $2,400 per participant (see Table 1).

Table 1

SUMMARY OF UPWARD BOUND PROJECT DATA
FY 1984 - FY 1986

	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986
No. of new projects	---	---	400
No. of continuation projects	422	421	---
Average award	$167,664	$174,856	$180,847
No. of persons served	32,600	32,500	30,000
Average Fed. cost per participant	$2,170	$2,265	$2,400
Budget authority	$70,754,376	$73,614,193	$72,388,636

Source: See E.1.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see the FY 1984 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

An internal study of program performance reports is planned for next year.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Richard T. Sonnergren, (202) 245-2165

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students: Special Services, Upward Bound, Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers, and the Training Program. Funds are not appropriated separately for the five programs but are allocated administratively.

TALENT SEARCH
(CFDA No. 84.044)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title IV, Sections 417A and B, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization1/	Appropriation1/	Allocation1/
1982	$165,000,000	$150,240,000	$17,057,594
1983	170,000,000	154,740,000	17,057,594
1984	170,000,000	164,740,000	17,628,233
1985	Indefinite	174,940,000	20,728,468
1986	Indefinite	168,786,000	19,606,841

Purposes: To identify qualified youths with potential for postsecondary education, to encourage them to complete secondary school and to enroll in postsecondary education programs, to publicize the availability of student financial aid, and to increase the number of secondary and postsecondary school dropouts who reenter an educational program.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The Department's objectives for the Talent Search program included the following:

- To establish project reporting procedures that will improve the Department's ability to assess individual projects and thus enable Department personnel to make better decisions about requests for grant renewals and more comprehensive assessments of program accomplishments, and
- To process and approve 177 noncompeting continuation grants.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department implemented new cost-effective procedures for review of the annual performance report, which the Office of Management and Budget had approved; the new project performance form will also be used to assess program accomplishments.
- A total of 176 grants were approved. One grantee agency went out of business.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1986, the Department made 176 continuation awards for a total of $19,606,841. The projects provided services to an estimated 190,000 participants at an average cost per participant of $103. The table shows comparable figures for the two previous years as well:

DISTRIBUTION OF NEW AND CONTINUING AWARDS
FY 1984 - FY 1986

	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986
New projects	---	177	---
Continuations	167	---	176
Average award	$105,558	$117,110	$111,403
Persons served	190,800	195,968	190,000
Average Fed. cost per participant	$92	$106	$103
Budget authority	$17,628,233	$20,728,468	$19,606,841

Source: See E.1.

In FY 1982, the latest year for which data are available, student participants were distributed as follows: about 41 percent were black, 32 percent white, 20 percent Hispanic, and 7 percent other ethnic groups. In addition, about 56 percent were women, and 44 percent were men.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see the FY 1985 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

An internal study of program performance data is planned for next year.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Richard Sonnergren, (202) 245-2165

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students: Special Services, Upward Bound, Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers, and the Training Program. Funds are not appropriated separately for these programs, but are allocated administratively to each program.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY CENTERS
(CFDA No. 84.066)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title IV, Sections 417A and B, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1c) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization[1]	Appropriation[1]	Allocation[1]
1982	$165,000,000	$150,240,000	$7,800,000
1983	170,000,000	154,740,000	7,800,000
1984	170,000,000	164,740,000	8,101,898
1985	Indefinite	174,940,000	9,209,468
1986	Indefinite	168,784,000	8,813,523

Purposes: To provide information on financial and academic assistance available to qualified adults who want postsecondary education and to help these people apply for admission to postsecondary educational institutions.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The Department's objectives for Educational Opportunity Centers (EOCs) included the following:

- To establish grant reporting procedures that would enable the Department to better assess individual projects and thus make better decisions about requests for grant renewals and more comprehensive assessments of program accomplishments,
- To process all non competing continuation applications, and
- To review existing EOC regulations and policies to determine whether the Department should pursue changes in the program.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department implemented the new cost-effective grant reporting procedures; the data from the 1984-85 reports will be summarized and analyzed in FY 1987.
- A total of 37 non competing continuation applications were reviewed and approved.
- Review of EOC regulations and policies is in progress.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1986, the Department made 37 continuation awards for a total of $8,813,523. The projects provided services to an estimated 102,984 participants at an average cost per participant of $94. The table shows comparable figures for the two previous years as well:

DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS
FY 1984 - FY 1986

	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986
New projects	---	37	---
Continuation	33	---	37
Average award	$245,512	$248,905	$238,203
Persons served	104,300	106,250	102,984
Average Fed. cost per participant	$78	$87	$94
Budget authority	$8,101,898	$9,209,468	$8,813,523

Source: See E.1.

Types of Benefits Provided: The EOCs identify persons who need the program's services, counsel them about opportunities for furthering their education, and help them apply for admission to postsecondary educational institutions and for financial aid. The centers also provide remedial and tutorial services to students enrolled or accepted for enrollment in postsecondary education.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see the FY 1985 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

An internal study of program performance data is planned for next year.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Richard Sonnergren, (202) 245-2165

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students: Special Services, Upward Bound, Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers, and the Training Program. Funds are not appropriated separately for these programs, but are allocated administratively to each program.

SPECIAL SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS
(CFDA No. 84.042)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title IV, Section 417A and 417D, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1b) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization[1]	Appropriation[1]	Allocation[1]
1982	$165,000,000	$150,240,000	$60,702,406
1983	170,000,000	154,740,000	60,555,892
1984	170,000,000	164,740,000	67,294,974
1985	Indefinite	174,940,000	70,083,664
1986	Indefinite	168,786,000	67,070,000

Purpose: To identify low-income, first-generation, or physically handicapped college students who are enrolled or accepted for enrollment by participating postsecondary institutions and to provide them with necessary support services to pursue programs of postsecondary education successfully.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives for the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students (SSDS) Program were as follows:

- To issue continuation grant awards to approximately 660 SSDS projects;
- To carry out a variety of cost-effective grant-monitoring procedures to allow the Department to assess individual project performance over time, to consider requests for continuation awards, and to assess overall program accomplishments;
- To notify project directors about program training opportunities and reporting requirements, and other timely information;
- To evaluate the new performance report form for the SSDS program grantees; and
- To accomplish all necessary planning and development for the FY 1987 SSDS competition so that an early FY 1987 closing date can be met.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department of Education issued a total of 660 continuation grant awards during FY 1986. Three current grantees did not apply or were found to be ineligible.
- A variety of cost-effective grant-monitoring procedures were implemented. These included extensive telephone monitoring, review of annual performance reports and other data, and on site monitoring by headquarters program staff and regional grant representatives.
- The Department sent all SSDS project directors information on training opportunities for SSDS staff, reporting requirements, revised income-level guidelines, funding reports, and follow up information to the 1985 Inspector General's report.
- More than 90 percent of the new performance report forms were received on time and were properly completed.
- Planning for the SSDS 1987 competition is proceeding on schedule.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1986, the Department made 660 continuation awards for a total of $67,070,000. Projects are expected to serve 153,000 participants at an average Federal cost per participant of $436. The table shows the comparable figures for the two previous years as well:

DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS
FY 1984 - FY 1986

	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986
New projects	664	---	---
Continuation	---	663	660
Average award	$101,348	$105,707	$ 101,621
Persons served	154,400	154,000	153,000
Average Fed. cost per participant	$436	$455	$438
Budget authority	$67,294,974	$70,083,664	$67,070,000

Source: See E.1.

Program Effectiveness:

No new information (see FY 1985 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

The new performance reports received from project directors contain impact data for the SSDS program. Once summarized and analyzed, these data will be used as an aid to program management.

Efforts will be made to increase on site monitoring of projects and to provide more technical assistance in order to improve project administration. The number of training opportunities for SSDS project staff is expected to increase.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A study of program files is planned for next year.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Richard T. Sonnergren, (202) 245-2165

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students: Special Services, Upward Bound, Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers, and the Training Program. Funds are not appropriated separately for the five programs, but are allocated administratively.

VETERANS' COST-OF-INSTRUCTION PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.064)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title IV, Section 420A, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1070e-1) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$12,000,000	$4,800,000
1983	12,000,000	3,000,000
1984	12,000,000	3,000,000
1985	Indefinite	3,000,000
1986	Indefinite	2,871,000

Purpose: To encourage colleges and universities to serve the special educational needs of veterans, especially Vietnam-era and disadvantaged veterans.

Applicants must demonstrate and document either a 10 percent increase in undergraduate veteran enrollment in the year of application over the preceding academic year, or a veteran enrollment constituting at least 10 percent of total enrollment. Only veterans who (1) are enrolled at least half-time and (2) are receiving benefits under Chapters 31 and 34 of Title 38, U.S.C., can be considered in the enrollment count.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- To complete processing of all required reports (budgets, financial status, and program performance reports) and make awards, and
- To visit at least one-third of the institutions funded and provide technical assistance as needed.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department of Education processed all documents, including applications for academic-year 1985-86 funds, and awarded grants to 601 institutions of higher education.
- Program staff participated in cross-program monitoring activities and conducted site visits as scheduled.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The Veterans' Cost-of-Instruction (VCIP) program was created in FY 1972. The peak year of veteran enrollment in postsecondary education was FY 1976, when there were approximately 910,000 enrolled veterans eligible for services. By FY 1981, the number of eligible veterans had declined to 212,000, and in the years since, the number has leveled off at approximately 200,000. Eligible enrollment is projected to rise above 300,000 in FY 1986 as a result of the new G.I. Bill.

Types of Benefits Provided: Institutions receiving VCIP funds must maintain a full-time Office of Veterans' Affairs and provide outreach and recruitment programs, counseling and tutorial services, and special education programs for veterans, with special emphasis on services for physically disabled, incarcerated, and educationally disadvantaged veterans.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1981 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are in progress or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: William J. Craven, Jr., (202) 245-3253

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION (FIPSE)
(CFDA No. 84.116)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higner Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title X, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1135 et seq.) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$13,500,000	$11,520,000
1983	13,500,000	11,710,000
1984	13,500,000	11,710,000
1985	50,000,000	12,710,000
1986	50,000,000	12,163,000

Purposes: To provide grants to support innovative projects to achieve the following purposes:

- To encourage the reform and improvement of postsecondary education and provide educational opportunity for all persons;
- To create institutions and programs that offer new paths to career and professional training and new combinations of academic and experiential learning;
- To establish institutions and programs based on the technology of communications;
- To carry out changes in the internal structure and operations of postsecondary educational institutions to clarify institutional priorities and purposes;
- To design and introduce cost-effective methods of instruction and operation;
- To introduce institutional reforms to expand opportunities for individuals to enter and reenter institutions and to pursue programs of study tailored to their needs;
- To introduce reforms in graduate education, in the structure of academic professions, and in the recruitment and retention of faculties; and
- To create new institutions and programs for examining individuals' skills and awarding credentials and for reforming current institutional practices related to credentials.

These goals are implemented under two programs:

Comprehensive Program. More than 95 percent of the money for the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) supports the action-oriented improvement projects included in the Comprehensive Program. Projects span the full range of postsecondary issues, including improvement in the quality of higher education, integration of education and work, applications of technology to learning, initiation of partnerships between schools and businesses, and delivery of appropriate educational services to a variety of learners.

Final-Year Dissemination Program. This program supports a small number of dissemination grants for selected FIPSE projects in their final year so that information about funded project activities can be spread to other institutions.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's lead objective for the Comprehensive Program was the improvement of undergraduate education by establishing the liberal arts as the core curriculum for all programs of education and training. Additional objectives were stressing the importance of assessing postsecondary education; making access to college meaningful by improving retention; the improvement of teacher education; introducing new technology into education and education for a changing economy.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Table 1 shows seven categories of current issues in which relatively large numbers of grants have been made in recent years and which now form a major part of the FIPSE portfolio of grants and completed projects. These themes do not cover all issues or problems addressed by FIPSE projects.

Table 1

NEW GRANTS, BY CATEGORY OF CURRENT ISSUES, FY 1986

Current Issue Category	Percent a/
Assessment	12
Economic growth	9
Improvements in undergraduate education	25
Integration of liberal arts	18
Making access to college meaningful	13
Reform in graduate and professional education	8
Teacher education	12
Total	97

Source: See E.1.

a/ Because some grants reflect several areas, the column does not add to 100 percent.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope

Seventy-five percent of all grants went to individual institutions of higher education, while the remainder went to consortiums of institutions, State agencies, professional associations, and other types of organizations involved in learning beyond postsecondary schooling (see Table 3).

Table 2

DISTRIBUTION OF FIPSE AWARDS BY PROGRAM AREA, FY 1986

Program Area	Number	Total Amount	Average Amount
New awards, total	81	$ 4,654,777	NA
Comprehensive	75	4,606,876	$61,425
Final-year dissemination	6	47,901	7,983
Noncompetitive continuation grants, Total	95	7,508,226	79,034
Total, all awards	176	$12,163,003	

Table 3

DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS, FY 1985 - FY 1986

	FY 1985	FY 1986
Total number of applications received:	2,116	2,124
Number of grants by institutional type and control:		
2-year public	19	18
2-year private	3	3
4-year public	71	77
4-year private	38	43
Other (including public and private organizations and individuals)	40	35
Total	171	181
Historically black colleges	(5)	(5)
Federal funds to:		
2-year public	$ 1,539,780	$ 1,281,180
2-year private	226,418	101,616
4-year public	5,232,295	5,355,471
4-year private	2,444,778	2,876,801
Other	3,266,606	2,547,932
Total appropriation	$12,709,877	$12,163,000
Historically black colleges	(553,867)	(305,880)

Source: See E.1.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1983 Annual Evaluation Report for the latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

FIPSE has clustered its projects to facilitate dissemination and management. In addition to existing technology, economics, and teacher education project clusters, a new cooperative effort on assessment of higher education is being organized and other possible clusters are being discussed.

FIPSE announced a new competition to award grants for lectures on major issues in postsecondary education. As many as six organizations will be awarded up to $5,000 each to present a major lecture about the appropriate aims of American postsecondary education. FIPSE lectures are intended to be presented at conferences or conventions, or within the scope of established lecture programs.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: John E. Donahue, (202) 245-8091

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-9401

TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SPECIAL PROGRAMS
STAFF AND LEADERSHIP PERSONNEL
(CFDA No. 84.103)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title IV, Section 417B(f), as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1d) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation 1/	Allocation 1/
1982	$165,000,000 2/	$150,240,000	$960,000
1983	170,000,000	154,740,000	960,000
1984	170,000,000	164,740,000	960,000
1985	Indefinite	174,940,000	1,302,975
1986	Indefinite	168,786,000	957,000

Purpose: To provide training for local project leaders and staff employed in, or preparing for employment in, Special Services, Upward Bound, Talent Search, or Educational Opportunity Center programs. The training grants are designed to improve the participants' skills in leadership, management, academic instruction, and counseling.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To publish funding priorities for the Training Program based on the Secretary's goals for 1986,
- To obtain recommendations on training priorities from persons in regional and State professional associations with special knowledge of the training needs of the staff for the Special Programs,
- To evaluate the performance of currently funded Training Program grantees,
- To approve 10 new Training Program grants, and
- To review Training Program regulations and policies to determine whether changes are needed.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- To implement the Secretary's goals for 1986, the Application Notice for the Training Program contained a section titled "Funding Priorities for Fiscal Year 1986." This section detailed priorities for FY 1986 Training Program grants: improving project administration, improving Upward Bound summer programs, and obtaining better retention of students participating in projects.
- Public comments on the training needs of Special Programs staff and leadership personnel were solicited at an open meeting and through a notice of Proposed Rulemaking on the Funding Priorities for FY 1986, published in the Federal Register, and a mass mailing to more than 1,000 project directors.
- The Department assessed the experience of currently funded Training Program grantees and used the information obtained to assign credit for prior experience.
- The Department received and processed 50 eligible grant applications and awarded 10 grants for FY 1986.
- The Training Program regulations were developed under the regulation reform policies and procedures and were published in final form in 1982. As a result of recent grant competitions, the Department is considering revising the selection criteria in the regulations to improve the evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of a proposed training program.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In FY 1986, $970,000 was awarded to 10 institutions and non profit organizations. Funding at this level will train about 1,000 participants.

The Training Program supports short-term training institutes, workshops, and inservice training programs to improve the skills of staff and leaders. More than 3000 staff persons have participated in the program over a three-year period. The table shows comparable figures for the two previous years as well:

DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS
FY 1984 - FY 1986

	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986
Projects	10	15	10
Average award	$96,000	$86,865	$95,700
Participants (est.)	1,019	1,496	1,000
Average Fed. cost per participant	$942	$871	$970
Budget authority	$960,000	$1,302,975	$957,000

Source: See E.1.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1983 Annual Evaluation Report for the latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

Efforts were made to increase onsite monitoring of projects and to provide more technical assistance in order to improve project administration. Another effort was to increase the number of training opportunities for Special Programs project staff.

All project directors are informed of available training opportunities.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Richard T. Sonnergren (202) 245-2165

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students: Special Services, Upward Bound, Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers, and the Training Program. Funds are not appropriated separately for these programs but are allocated administratively.
2. Beginning in FY 1982, the Training Program became a discretionary grant program instead of a contract program.

INSTITUTIONAL AID PROGRAMS
(CFDA No. 84.031)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title III, P.L. 89-329, as amended by P.L. 96-374, P.L. 98-95, P.L. 98-312 (Section 1), P.L. 98-139, P.L. 98-619, and P.L. 99-498 (U.S.C. 1051-1069) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$129,600,000[1]	$134,416,000
1983	129,600,000[1]	134,416,000
1984	129,600,000[1]	134,416,000
1985	270,000,000	141,208,000
1986	270,000,000	135,136,000

Purpose: To help institutions of higher education that have limited financial resources and that serve significant percentages of low-income students to improve their academic programs, institutional management, fiscal stability, and student services. The ultimate objective is institutional self-sufficiency.

Eligibility: Eligible institutions are defined in the legislation as institutions of higher education that (1) provide an educational program that awards a bachelor's degree (4-year institutions) or an associate's degree (junior or community colleges); (2) are accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or are making reasonable progress toward such accreditation; (3) have satisfied both of the foregoing requirements during the 5 academic years preceding the academic year during which program assistance would be provided, with the exception that the 5-year stipulation may be waived by the Secretary for institutions that provide services to increase the higher education opportunities available to American Indian, Spanish-speaking, rural, black, or low-income students; (4) enroll a relatively high percentage of low-income students receiving Federal student financial assistance; and (5) have lower educational and general expenditures than do similar institutions.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department of Education's principal goals were as follows:

- o To maintain the Department's commitment to historically black colleges;
- o To provide technical assistance to and review of ongoing projects.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o The percentage of funding received by historically black colleges increased in FY 1986.
- o Program staff visits to institutions were limited to those in greatest need of technical assistance.

C. Cost and Benefits

Types of Benefits: The Title III program was originally established to help historically black colleges and other institutions that needed assistance in improving their management and educational programs. The administration looks to this program as an important funding source for historically black colleges.

The Institutional Aid Programs consists of four programs as follows:

The Strengthening Institutions Program (Part A) provides 1- to 3-year renewable grants and 4- to 7-year nonrenewable grants. At least 25 percent of the funds appropriated under this program must be used for nonrenewable grants. At least 24 percent of the funds must be awarded to 2-year institutions. Funds may be used for planning or faculty development, curriculum development, special services, management improvement activities, purchase of equipment for curriculum and management improvement, and shared use of facilities.

The Institutions with Special Needs Program (Part B) provides nonrenewable, 1- to 5-year grants. Under this program, historically black colleges and universities must receive at least 50 percent of the funds they received under Title III in FY 1979, or $27,035,000. At least 30 percent of the funds under this program must be awarded to 2-year institutions. Funds may be used for planning or faculty development, curriculum development, special services or management improvement activities, purchase of equipment for curriculum and management improvement, and shared use of facilities.

The Challenge Grant Program (Part C) is no longer authorized to make new awards. Multiyear awards made prior to FY 1983 will continue until termination.

The Endowment Grant Program (also Part C) provides eligible institutions with a Federal grant that matches institutionally raised endowment funds. The minimum award is $50,000, and the maximum award, $500,000. Institutions are eligible to receive two grants within a 5-year cycle. The cycle begins the first year that an institution receives an award. An institution must, however, establish eligibility for program participation each year it applies for funds. There are no restrictions on the use of the income produced by the endowment except that an institution may not spend the principal or more than 50 percent of the annual income produced during the 20-year period beginning with the initial grant.

Program Scope: Table 1 shows the obligations by program part for FY 1985 and 1986. In FY 1986, greater emphasis was placed on funding planning and renewable 1- to 3-year grants under the Strengthening Program (Part A) and the Endowment Grant Program (Part C). The percentage of funding received by historically black institutions increased in FY 1986, in line with the administration's goal of increasing Federal funding to black colleges (see Table 2).

Table 1

OBLIGATIONS BY PROGRAM, FISCAL YEARS 1985 and 1986

Descriptive Measures	Number of Awards		Number of Awards New		Amount of Average Award		Federal Cost	
	1985	1986	1985	1986	1985	1986	1985	1986
Part A: Strengthening Program								
Total	313	322	118	117	$208,037	$187,946	$65,115,621	$60,518,753
Planning grants	20	16	20	16	$ 23,314	$ 23,517	$ 466,285	$ 376,278
1- to 3-year grants	142	211	98	101	164,790	163,815	23,400,177	34,564,922
4 to 7-year grants	151	95	0	0	273,173	269,237	41,249,159	25,577,53
Part B: Special Needs								
1- to 5-year grants	163	144	30	5	$327,481	$332,601	$53,379,352	$47,894,555
Part C:								
Total	81	89	59	74	NA	NA	$21,983,075	$25,671,955
Challenge grants	22	15	0	0	266,174	297,464	5,855,830	4,461,955
Endowment grants	59	74	59	74	273,343	300,135	16,127,245	22,210,000
Program totals a/	557	555	207	196	$252,205	$243,397	$140,478,048	$135,085,263

Note: Figures for FY 1986 are estimates.

a/These are number of awards and not number of institutions awarded. An institution may receive up to three awards--an endowment, a challenge grant, and either a Part A or a Part B award.

Source: See E.1.

Table 2

INSTITUTIONAL AID PROGRAM OBLIGATIONS BY INSTITUTIONAL RACE/ETHNICITY, LEVEL OF OFFERING, AND CONTROL, FISCAL YEARS 1985 and 1986

Race/ Ethnicity	FY 1985		Percentage of Total Dollars	FY 1986		Percentage of Total Dollars
	Number of Awards	Obligations (000's)		Number of Awards	Obligations (000's)	
Historically black	127	$45,731	32.6	124	$45,556	33.7
Predominantly black	27	6,509	4.6	22	4,891	3.6
White	356	77,369	55.0	359	72,664	53.8
American Indian	9	2,205	1.6	7	2,252	1.7
Asians/Pacific Islanders	9	1,989	1.4	9	2,543	1.9
Hispanic	29	6,675	4.8	34	7,179	5.3
Total	557	$140,478	100.0	555	$135,085	100.0
Level of Offering and Control						
4-Year private	174	$ 49,981	37.1	164	$ 46,633	34.5
4-Year public	106	34,655	25.3	113	35,078	26.0
2-Year private	36	7,400	5.7	27	4,617	3.4
2-Year public	241	48,442	31.9	251	48,757	36.1
Total	557	$140,478	100.0	555	$135,085	100.0

Source: See E.1.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1984 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

The FY 1986 appropriation was to ensure funding for historically black colleges at a level of not less than $43,774,000 under all Title III programs, not simply for Part B, as is stated in the authorizing legislation.

The Department has proposed to consolidate the current four programs into two programs and to simplify the eligibility rules. Part A and Part B programs would be merged, the Endowment Grant Program (Part C) would be maintained, and the Challenge Grant Program (Part C) would continue to be phased out.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, FY 1986, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

A study of program files is planned for next year.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Joan DeSantis, (202) 732-3312

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 established the authorization level for FY 1982 through FY 1984 at $129,600,000; however, the appropriations for each of these years effectively raised these authorization levels to the higher amounts.

MINORITY INSTITUTIONS SCIENCE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.120)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title X, Part B, Subpart 1, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1135b)(expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$5,000,000	$4,800,000
1983	5,000,000	4,800,000
1984	5,000,000	4,800,000
1985	5,000,000	5,000,000
1986	5,000,000	4,785,000

Purposes: To help minority institutions improve the quality of their science education programs and better prepare their students for graduate work or careers in science; to improve the access of undergraduate minority students to careers in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering; to improve access for precollege minority students to careers in science and engineering through community outreach programs conducted by eligible minority colleges and universities; and to improve the capability of minority institutions for self-assessment, management, and evaluation of their science programs and dissemination of their results.

Eligibility: Private and public, accredited, 2-year and 4-year institutions of higher education are eligible if their enrollments are predominantly (50 percent or more) American Indian; Alaskan native; black, not of Hispanic origin; Hispanic; Pacific Islander; or any combination of these or other disadvantaged ethnic minorities who are underrepresented in science and engineering. Proposals may also be submitted by nonprofit, science-oriented organizations; professional scientific societies; and all nonprofit, accredited colleges and universities that will render a needed service to a group of institutions for the Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program (MISIP) or provide inservice training for project directors, scientists, or engineers from eligible minority institutions.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- To maintain the Department's commitment to providing financial assistance to minority institutions,

- To provide participants with technical assistance and conduct audit reviews, and
- To complete processing of grant applications within 6 months of closing notice.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department's commitment to MISIP was maintained for FY 1986.
- Technical assistance in FY 1986 was limited.
- The Department processed all grants within the target period.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Almost 60 percent of the funds were expended for institutional grants. Total awards decreased from 38 in FY 1985 to 37 in FY 1986, as Table 1 shows.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS UNDER THE
MINORITY INSTITUTIONS SCIENCE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
FY 1984 - FY 1986

Type of Award	Maximum Size and Duration	1984		1985		1986	
		Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Numb
Institutional	$300,000 (3 year)	$3,703,396	16	$2,939,897	14	$2,808,808	14
Cooperative	500,000 (3 year)	0	0	987,009	3	1,162,995	3
Design	20,000 (1 year)	0	0	18,828	1	35,858	2
Special	150,000 (2 year)	1,086,604	18	1,072,240	20	776,832	18
Total		$4,790,000	34	$5,017,974	38	$4,784,493	37

Source: See E.1.

Table 2 indicates that 186 out of 265 eligible institutions (approximately 70 percent) participated in the program through FY 1986:

Table 2

MINORITY INSTITUTIONS SCIENCE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
INSTITUTIONAL PARTICIPATION, FY 1972 - FY 1986

Predominant Minority Group	Number Eligible[a]	Number of Awards[b]	Number of Institutions Receiving Awards[c]
Alaskan native	4	2	1
American Indian	25	32	21
Black	160	257	115
Mexican-American	16	24	1
Puerto Rican	25	48	20
Micronesian	3	4	2
Combination/other	32	43	16
Total	265	410	186

a. Does not include 34 institutions that lack accreditation or have uncertain eligibility or accreditation.

b. Some institutions have received more than one award.

c. Includes nine nonaccredited American Indian institutions and one Hawaiian institution not included in the current eligibility count.

Source: See E.1.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1983 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

The program continues to focus on improving the quality of instruction in mathematics and science at minority institutions and on improving access for minority students to careers in science and engineering.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS [Response to GEPA 417(b)]

Program staff will summarize reports to be filed by institutions for FY 1987.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Argelia Velez-Rodriguez, (202) 245-3253

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

LAW SCHOOL CLINICAL EXPERIENCE PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.097)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title IX, Part E, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1134n-1134p) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$1,000,000	$ 960,000
1983	1,000,000	605,000
1984	1,000,000	1,000,000
1985	1,500,000	1,500,000
1986	2,000,000	1,435,000

Purpose: To establish or expand programs in accredited law schools to provide clinical experience to law students.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the major program objectives were to continue funding successful projects and to fund new projects that met the funding criteria.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1986, 40 applicants were awarded a total of $1,435,000.

C. Costs and Benefits

Types of Benefits Provided: The Law School Clinical Experience program supports expanded supervision of students engaged in clinical experience while allowing institutions to develop and expand their clinical curriculums. During the 1985-86 academic year, about 1,550 law students benefited from a supervised clinical experience supported by the 44 project grants.

Program Scope: For the 1985-86 academic year, $1.5 million was awarded from FY 1985 funds to support clinical legal education programs at 44 law schools. Academic year 1986-87 grant award amounts will be about the same.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1984 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

LEGAL TRAINING FOR THE DISADVANTAGED
(CFDA No. 84.136)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title IX, Part D, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1134l-1134m) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$ 1,000,000	$ 960,000
1983	1,000,000	1,000,000
1984	1,000,000	1,000,000
1985	10,000,000	1,500,000
1986	10,000,000	1,435,000

Purpose: To help persons from disadvantaged backgrounds to undertake training in the legal profession.

Eligibility: Public and private agencies and organizations other than institutions of higher education are eligible to apply for grants or contracts under this program. A noncompetitive project grant is awarded annually to the Council on Legal Educational Opportunity (CLEO) to administer the program.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- To increase participation of minority and economically disadvantaged groups within the legal profession;
- To serve persons who aspire and are qualified to enter the legal profession but who, because of substantial economic deficiency and marginal admissions credentials, may be unable to gain admission to law school under prevailing standards; and
- To provide these students with the opportunity for law school matriculation through the operation of summer institutes and the provision of annual fellowships.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Support through this program has enabled the CLEO, in concert with participating law schools, to achieve the following:

- Prospective law students who are members of minority or economically disadvantaged groups and who need the services provided by the program have been identified.

- o Seven regional institutes across the country have been conducted to provide intensive prelaw training to students in the summer before their entrance into law school; each student has been evaluated at the end of the institute to assess the student's potential for successfully mastering the law school curriculum; and law school placement assistance has been provided for all successful students.

- o Annual stipends of $1,750 have been provided to all students who have successfully completed the summer institutes and are enrolled in a law school accredited by the American Bar Association.

C. Costs and Benefits

Institutes: For academic year 1985-86, more than 220 potential first-year law students received 6 weeks of intensive prelaw training during the summer at seven law schools selected by CLEO to run these institutes. About 99 percent of these students completed the institutes and were admitted to law schools. They joined more than 400 other CLEO students now in their second or third year of legal study.

Types of Benefits Provided: The CLEO program has two main direct services for students in addition to its services for the law schools: 6-week summer institutes of intensive legal study for prospective law students and annual fellowships of $1,750 to successful graduates of the summer institutes who attend law schools. In addition, participating law schools waive tuition and fees for these students.

Program Effectiveness: In the past 16 years, CLEO has helped 4,200 students from disadvantaged backgrounds gain admission to law schools. As of June 1985, 2,000 CLEO students had successfully completed law school (see E.1). The awards and expenses for CLEO are summarized in the table:

SUMMARY OF AWARDS AND EXPENSES FOR CLEO,
FY 1985 - FY 1986

	FY 1985 (est.)		FY 1986 (est.)	
	Amount	Number of Students	Amount	Number of Students
New awards	$ 668,500	328	$ 652,160	320
Continuations	367,500	210	367,500	210
Summer institutes	210,000	200	210,000	200
Administrative costs	254,000	-	205,340	-
Total	$1,500,000	738	$1,435,000	730

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

FELLOWSHIPS FOR GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDY
(CFDA No. 84.094)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title IX, Part B, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1134d-1134g) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$14,000,000	$10,560,000
1983	14,000,000	11,920,000
1984	14,000,000	13,500,000
1985	Indefinite	14,250,000
1986	Indefinite	13,638,000

Purpose: To assist graduate and professional students who demonstrate financial need. Fellowships may be awarded to support students in two categories: (1) Graduate and Professional Opportunity Fellowships are awarded to individuals from groups who are underrepresented in graduate or professional study; (2) Public Service Education Fellowships are awarded to persons who plan to begin or continue a career in public service.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships are intended to meet the following objectives:

- To provide access to graduate and professional education for qualified minorities and women who otherwise might be unable to obtain graduate education;
- To meet national employment needs for well-trained persons, particularly minorities and women, in career fields of high national priority; and
- To provide incentives to institutions of higher education to recruit new students, maintain continuation students, and graduate minority and women students in high-quality professional and academic programs.

Public Service Fellowships are intended to meet the following objectives:

- To provide access to graduate education in public service for 198 qualified minorities and women who otherwise might be unable to obtain graduate education;
- To increase the participation of minorities and women at the highest levels of public service, especially at the State and local levels; and
- To provide incentives to institutions of higher education to recruit 126 new students, maintain 72 continuation students, and graduate 150 minority and women students in high-quality public service programs.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships:

- Grantees recruited 1,417 minority students and women for fellowships in the fields of study selected during the peer review process.
- More than half of the fellowships were awarded in the physical sciences, engineering, and life sciences.
- The program awarded $1,220,100 in fellowships to 18 historically black colleges and universities in the FY 1986 competition.

Public Service Fellowships:

- The program encouraged practical experience and internships in public administration positions as an integral part of the curriculum for master's degree programs in public administration.
- Students participating in the program are no longer predominantly white men but are predominantly women and minority men.
- The program supported eight historically black colleges and universities by awarding about $310,800 in fellowships to students at those institutions under the FY 1986 competition.

C. Costs and Benefits

Students Served: In FY 1986, the Department awarded fellowship stipends based on financial need up to a maximum of $4,500 per 12-month period. It also gave an institutional allowance of $3,900 per year for each fellow enrolled in the program. Fellows must be full-time students and ordinarily cannot have the fellowships renewed beyond a 36-month period.

Program Scope

Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships:

From FY 1986 funds, 162 grants totaling $11,245,000 were made to colleges and universities to support 965 students in their second or third year of full-time graduate or professional study, and to support another 452 new students beginning study during 1986-87. The fellows are expected to study in academic and professional areas in roughly the same proportions as they have previously. Table 1 shows the distribution of awards by subject area for the 1985-86 academic year.

Table 1
DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS,
BY SUBJECT AREA, ACADEMIC YEAR 1985-86

Subject Area	Number of Awards	Percentage of Total
Physical sciences	205	14.4
Engineering	173	12.2
Life sciences	365	25.7
Social sciences	194	13.6
Psychology	116	8.1
Humanities	20	1.4
Math and computer sciences	56	3.6
Law	215	15.2
Business	73	5.1
Education	11	0.7
	1,428	100.0

Source: See E.1.

The distribution of 1986 fellows by sex and race is expected to be similar to the FY 1985 distribution, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2
DISTRIBUTION OF FELLOWS IN THE GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDY PROGRAM,
BY RACE/ETHNICITY, ACADEMIC YEAR 1985-86

Race/Ethnicity	Number of Fellows	Percentage of Total
Black	580	40.9
Hispanic	295	20.9
Asian-American	150	10.6
American indian	89	6.3
White women	303	21.3
Total	1,417	100.0

NOTE: Women accounted for more than 50 percent of the fellows in the academic year 1985-86 program.

Source: See E.1.

Public Service Fellowships:

From FY 1986 funds, 66 grants totaling $2,387,000 were made to colleges and universities to support 72 students in their second year of full-time graduate study, and to support another 126 new students beginning their first year of study during 1986-87. A total of 92 new awards were extended for the second year 1987-88. Fellows supported under the program are restricted to study in the field of public administration or to closely related areas such as urban affairs, public policy analysis, international affairs, and environmental/natural resources administration.

Students participating in the program are predominantly women and minority men. The number of minority and female participants is expected to increase gradually. Table 3 shows FY 1985 distribution:

Table 3
DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE FELLOWSHIPS PROGRAM, BY RACE/ETHNICITY, FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 1985-86

Race/Ethnicity	Number of Fellows	Percentage of Total
White		
Men	53	27.3
Women	69	35.5
Black	39	20.1
Hispanic	26	13.4
Asian-American	9	3.0
American Indian	2	0.7
Total	198	100.0

NOTE: Women accounted for about 65 percent of the fellows in the academic year 1985-86 program.

Source: See E.1.

Program Effectiveness:

No new information (see FY 1985 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS [Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

FULBRIGHT-HAYS TRAINING GRANTS PROGRAM
(CFDA Nos. 84.019, 84.020, 84.021, 84.022)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Fulbright-Hays Act), Section 102(b)(6), P.L. 87-256 (22 U.S.C. 2452 (b)(6)) and Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Sections 104(b)(2) and (3), P.L. 83-480 (7 U.S.C. 1691) (no expiration date).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	Indefinite	$4,800,000
1983	Indefinite	5,000,000
1984	Indefinite	5,000,000
1985	Indefinite	5,500,000
1986	Indefinite	5,263,000

Purposes: This program provides support for faculty research, group projects, and doctoral dissertation research abroad and for foreign curriculum consultants in this country.

Faculty Research Abroad: To strengthen programs of international studies at universities and colleges by providing opportunities for research and study abroad in foreign languages and area studies, by enabling faculty members to keep current in their specialties, by facilitating curriculum updating, and by helping to improve teaching methods and materials.

Group Projects Abroad: To help educational institutions improve their programs in modern foreign languages and area studies.

Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad: To provide opportunities for graduate students to conduct full-time dissertation research abroad in modern foreign languages and area studies and to develop research knowledge and capability about areas of the world not widely studied in U.S. institutions.

Foreign Curriculum Consultants: To enable institutions to bring specialists from other countries to the United States to help plan and develop curriculums in modern foreign languages and area studies.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

The objective for FY 1986 was to award project grants and fellowships within the prescribed schedule.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Faculty Research Abroad: Following a national competition, including domestic peer review and overseas host country approval, the Department made 31 awards to institutions for individual Faculty Research Fellowships.

Group Projects Abroad: Ninety-one applications were received from 29 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico for Group Projects Abroad. All applications were reviewed by a panel of experts, Department staff and the Board of Foreign Scholarships, and 36 awards were made.

Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad: After a national competition that involved domestic peer review and overseas host country approval, 108 awards were made for individual research fellowships.

Foreign Curriculum Consultants: Twenty-four applications, representing 15 States, for the Foreign Curriculum Consultants program were received. All applications were reviewed by a panel of external academic experts, Department staff, and the Board of Foreign Scholarships and eight awards were made.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The following awards were made in FY 1986:

- Faculty Research Abroad: 31 fellowships at 24 institutions for an amount of $715,787 in U.S. dollars and $91,062 from the U.S.-owned foreign currency program for a total of $806,849.
- Group Projects Abroad: 36 projects for a total of $2,427,798; 28 projects used U.S. dollars in the amount of $1,901,400, and 8 projects were supported under the U.S.-owned foreign currency category for a total of $525,998.
- Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad: 108 fellowships to 32 institutions for an amount of $573,382 in U.S. dollars and $127,923 from the U.S.-owned foreign currency program for a total of $701,305.
- Foreign Curriculum Consultants: 8 projects for a total of $163,466.
- Special Bilateral Projects: 11 projects for a total of $931,486 in Italy, Israel, South Korea, China, Brazil, Liberia, India, and Pakistan.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1981 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are in progress or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Peter W. Schramm, (202) 732-3286

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8281

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRAINING AND AREA STUDIES
(CFDA Nos. 84.015, 84.016, 84.017, 84.153)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title VI, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1121 et seq.) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$30,600,000	$19,200,000
1983	30,600,000	21,000,000
1984	30,600,000	25,800,000
1985	87,500,000	26,500,000
1986	87,500,000	25,408,000

Purposes:

Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Languages Programs: (1) To help institutions of higher education to plan, develop, and carry out a comprehensive program to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign languages and (2) to help associations and organizations to develop projects that will make significant contribution to strengthening and improving undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign languages.

National Resource Centers: To promote instruction in those modern foreign languages and area and international studies critical to national needs by supporting the establishment, strengthening, and operation of such programs at colleges and universities.

Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships: To meet the needs of the United States for experts in modern foreign languages, area studies, and world affairs by supporting fellowships for advanced study at institutions for higher education.

International Research and Studies: To improve training in foreign languages and area studies through support of research and studies, experimentation, and development of specialized instructional materials.

Business and International Education Programs: To provide suitable international education and training for business personnel in various stages of professional development and to promote education and training that will contribute to the ability of U.S. businesses to prosper in an international economy.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

In FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives for these program components were as follows:

Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Programs:

- To strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign languages;
- To strengthen the acquisition of knowledge and skills in professional fields that have an international component, such as agriculture, business, education, law, and journalism, or that develop skills for the analysis of critical issues such as economic development, technology utilization, national security, or international trade; and
- To increase the use of computers to teach modern foreign languages and to collect and analyze information about critical international issues.

National Resource Centers:

- To urge grantees to adopt standards and testing procedures compatible with the most recent standards adopted by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages;
- To initiate or strengthen linkages between language and area studies and professional schools;
- To strengthen the language programs by increasing instruction in grantees' introductory and intermediate language skill courses to 10 hours per week and by adding advanced third- and fourth-year regular language skill courses; and
- To initiate or expand outreach activities in teacher education through technical assistance and inservice training in language and area studies and international education.

Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships:

- To award fellowships to students who combine language and area studies with professional studies;
- To award fellowships to students studying the less commonly taught languages and cultures of non-Western countries; and
- To award fellowships to students or faculty members enrolled in cooperative, advanced, intensive foreign-language programs in the United States or abroad.

Business and International Education:

- To promote innovation and improvement in international business education curriculums and to increase the international business skills of the business community through linkages between institutions of higher education and the business community.

The International Research and Studies Program:

- To emphasize research in the use of computers for improving foreign language instruction;
- To emphasize research in foreign-language acquisition and improved teaching methodologies for foreign languages; and
- To improve foreign language proficiency testing and the development of instructional materials for uncommonly taught languages.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign-Language Programs:

- All funded projects included a component designed to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in modern foreign languages.
- Two funded projects, including one submitted by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, incorporated an international perspective into the core program of professional studies for teachers. The Educational Testing Service will conduct a series of workshops to train teachers of French, German, and Spanish in oral proficiency testing techniques. These projects were funded for a third phase in 1986.
- Many projects included computer-assisted instruction in foreign languages or used interactive TV instructional systems for the teaching of international studies and foreign languages.

National Resource Centers

- Additional funds were allocated for work on proficiency testing using the most recent guidance from the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Proficiency testing was again included as a priority activity for the centers applying for FY 1986 funding, and an increased proportion of program funds was allocated for this purpose.
- Technical assistance for grantees and applicants for FY 1986 continues to stress the need to improve intrauniversity linkages, particularly with professional schools.
- Additional funds were allocated for intensifying introductory and intermediate language instruction or for adding third- or fourth-year language skill courses.
- Additional funds were devoted to teacher education activities; outreach in teacher education was a priority in FY 1986 funding.

Foreign-Language and Area Studies Fellowships:

- Combining language and area studies with professional school programs has been a program funding priority. Data are not yet available on actual awards.
- At least 75 percent of the fellowship awards were for the less commonly taught non-Western languages; a large proportion of the remaining 25 percent were for students of Western languages such as Portuguese and Dutch, and for other languages such as Quechua.
- Fellowship awards for students and faculty to participate in intensive language programs in the summer of 1986 approached 14 percent of all fellowships.

Business and International Education:

- All grantees have linkage agreements with businesses involved in export-related trade or international economic activities.

The International Research and Studies Program:

Funded projects include those focusing on language proficiency testing, development of new instructional materials, use of computers in language instruction, and improvement of teaching methodologies and language acquisition. One project will develop a survey of foreign-language enrollments at the college level.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope

A SUMMARY OF FUNDING BY PROGRAM AREAS,
FY 1984 - FY 1986

Program	FY 1984		FY 1985		FY 1986	
	No. of Awards	Total Funding	No. of Awards	Total Funding	No. of Awards	Total Funding
Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Programs	71	$ 3,000,000	67	$ 3,100,000	54	$ 2,906,000
National Resource Centers [a]	91	12,100,000	93	12,200,000	93	11,436,000
Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship Programs	117	7,200,000	114	7,550,000	114	7,550,000
(Fellowships)	(800)		(842)		(842)	
International Research and Studies	35	1,475,442	27	1,447,133	15	1,406,000
Business and International Education Program	37	2,000,000	35	2,300,000	35	2,110,000
Total, all programs	351	$25,775,442	336	$26,597,133	311	$25,408,0

Source: See E.1.

[a] Eighty-three of the centers were comprehensive (serving graduate and undergraduate students) and 10 were for undergraduate students.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1983 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, FY 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Peter W. Schramm, (202) 732-3286

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

COOPERATIVE EDUCATION
(CFDA No. 84.055)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title VIII, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1133-1133b) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$20,000,000	$14,400,000
1983	20,000,000	14,400,000
1984	20,000,000	14,400,000
1985	35,000,000	14,400,000
1986	35,000,000	13,781,000

Purposes: To provide Federal support for (1) the planning, establishment, and development of cooperative education projects in higher education institutions; (2) projects demonstrating or exploring the feasibility and value of innovative methods of cooperative education; (3) projects training persons to conduct cooperative education programs; and (4) research into methods of improving, developing, or promoting cooperative education programs in institutions of higher education. Cooperative education programs have alternating or parallel periods of academic study and employment related to the student's academic program or professional goals.

Eligibility: Accredited institutions of higher education and consortiums of such institutions are eligible. Other nonprofit agencies and organizations are also eligible for training and research grants.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986 the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To encourage institutions to initiate cooperative education for all students,
- To stimulate the development of cooperative education programs for newly participating institutions, and
- To provide training grants to help faculty members and administrators to design and implement cooperative education programs and to emphasize the improvement of training techniques.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1986 the following activities were funded:

- Seven comprehensive (institution wide) demonstration grants were awarded, bringing the total to date to 69.
- New administration awards increased from 152 in FY 1984 to 160 in FY 1986; continuation awards increased from 32 to 39.
- Six new and two continuation training grants were awarded.

C. Costs and Benefits

Four categories of grants are provided under this program:

1. Administration Grants: These projects generally focus on a single department or cluster of departments in an institution of higher education. Funds are used to develop and strengthen cooperative education programs and to strengthen and expand linkages with employers (and local high school cooperative education programs).
2. Comprehensive Demonstration Grants: These large grants help institutions plan and initiate institution wide cooperative education for postsecondary programs of study.
3. Research Grants: These projects collect, study, and disseminate information on cooperative education programs and practices (none were funded in FY 1986).
4. Training Grants: These projects provide information to institution program directors and faculty and business professionals about how to administer and expand their cooperative education programs.

Program Scope: In FY 1986, 347 eligible applications were submitted, requesting a total of $63,402,687; less than half of the applicants (160) received awards from the $13,780,000 appropriation. Of these, 145 were administration grants, totaling $10,344,346; 7 were comprehensive demonstration grants, totaling $2,574,887; and 8 were training grants, totaling $860,767. Grants totaling $4,754,100 were awarded to 56 private institutions of higher education; $8,957,000 was awarded to 103 public institutions; and 1 grant, totaling $68,900, was awarded to a nonprofit organization (see Table 1).

Table 1 shows that although funding remained near constant ($14,000,000) over the FY 1984-FY 1986 period, fewer institutions received funding. The distribution of grants also changed. In particular, 4-year public institutions, which had received 37 percent of the grants in FY 1984, obtained 25 percent in 1986. The number of grants to 4-year private institutions remained constant over the 3-year period, but as Table 2 shows, the average size of awards increased from $64,655 to $85,185.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS BY TYPE AND CONTROL FOR COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM, FY 1984 - FY 1986

	FY 1984			FY 1985			FY 1986(est.)		
Type and Control	No.	Amount (000s)	%	No.	Amount (000s)	%	No.	Amount (000s)	%
Public									
2-year	65	$5,146	36	64	$5,094	3	63	$5,512	40
4-year	58	5,305	37	55	4,280	3	40	3,445	25.0
Private									
2-year	5	183	1	5	244		1	68	0.5
4-year	55	3,556	25	52	4,431	31	55	4,685	34.0
Public & private organizations	1	210	1	2	311	2	1	68	0.5
Total	184	$14,400	100%	178	$14,360	100%	160%	13,780	100%

Source: See E.1.

Table 2

AVERAGE AWARDS IN THE COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM BY INSTITUTION TYPE, FY 1984 - FY 1986

Type and Control	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986(est.)
Public			
2-year	$79,169	$79,594	$87,492
4-year	91,466	77,818	86,125
Private			
2-year	36,600	48,800	68,900
4-year	64,655	85,211	85,185

Source: See E.1.

Average awards to institutions classified by race and ethnicity also changed over the 3-year period (Tables 3 and 4), but no pattern of change is apparent.

Table 3

DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS BY RACE/ETHNICITY FOR COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM, FY 1984 - FY 1986

	FY 1984			FY 1985			FY 1986 (est.)		
Race/Ethnicity	No.	Amount (000's)	%	No.	Amount (000's)	%	No.	Amount (000's)	%
Historically black	6	$ 342	2	5	$ 357	3	4	$ 217	2
Predominantly black	6	466	3	6	464	3	0	0	0
American Indian	1	50	1	1	130	1	0	0	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	2	272	2	1	64	1	0	0	0
White	166	13,270	92	164	13,345	92	156	13,563	98
Total	181	$14,400	100%	177	$14,360	100%	160	$13,780	100%

Source: See E.1.

Table 4

AVERAGE AWARDS TO SELECTED INSTITUTIONS SERVING MINORITY STUDENTS, FY 1984 - FY 1986

	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986 (est.)
Historically black	$56,933	$71,400	$54,250
Predominantly black	93,220	73,333	0
American Indian	50,000	65,000	0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	64,800	0
Hispanic	90,666	64,000	0

Source: See E.1.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see FY 1981 Annual Evaluation Report for most recent information).

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., FY 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Development: Elizabeth Slany, (202) 245-2511

Program Operations : Stanley B. Patterson, (202) 732-4393

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.142)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Housing Act of 1950, Title VII, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (expires September 30, 1991); Participation Sales Act of 1966 (12 U.S.C. 1717[c]); HUD and; Independent Agencies Appropriation Acts of 1964 (12 U.S.C. 1749d), 1967, 1968, and 1976; Department of Education Organization Act, Section 306 (20 U.S.C. 3446) (no expiration date).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation		
		Annual	Permanent	Loan Authority
1982	Indefinite	0	$232,000	$40,000,000
1983	"	0	40,000	40,000,000
1984	"	0	0	40,000,000
1985	"	0	0	40,000,000
1986	"	0	0	57,420,000

Purposes: To provide assistance for student and faculty housing and related facilities through direct loans in support of new construction or acquisition and rehabilitation of existing facilities and to reduce fuel consumption and other operating costs of these facilities. Recently, loans have been limited to support for especially cost-effective energy conservation rehabilitation projects, facility renovations, and relief of severe local housing shortages.

Eligibility: The College Housing Program assists higher education institutions and eligible college housing agencies with direct, low-interest construction loans. Loan capital is made available through a revolving fund financed with U.S. Treasury borrowings and proceeds from the sale of public securities (investor participations in the existing college housing loan portfolio) marketed through the Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA).

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives for the College Housing Program were as follows:

o To provide the congressionally directed level of new loan assistance and to award those loans to institutions having the highest quality project plans and demonstrating the most need;

A. Objectives (continued)

- To administer the annual loan competition in an accurate and sound manner and to ensure that awards are made on schedule;
- To continue efforts to improve credit management to ensure that sound loans are made and to ensure that the Federal interest is protected, especially through improvement of program verification and validation controls;
- To service the existing loan portfolio in a sound manner and to provide special counsel and management on defaulted and other problem loans;
- To plan and prepare for the sale of currently held loans to private investors--such preparation to include a review of loan files and legal documentation, the rehabilitation or reconstruction of these files as needed, and an asset evaluation of the entire portfolio--and
- To support the objectives of the President's Executive Order 12320 to assist historically black colleges and universities.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- For FY 1986, the Department is planning to award $57.4 million in new loan commitments in support of 14 housing construction and 22 energy conservation projects. A total of 127 applications were received and are being reviewed. The Department is using engineering consultants to review and monitor projects to ensure project feasibility and compliance with architectural, engineering, and other building design requirements. A computer program is being used to rank applications.
- The Department of Education improved its credit management--
  - By using the government field expense allotments, a legislative set-aside, to monitor projects through the construction period;
  - By continuing to take steps to ensure the financial soundness of new loans, using such resources as Federal Reserve Bank delinquency listings, financial status reports, and regulatory provisions relating to institutional eligibility and loan cancellation;
  - By completing an inventory of all closed projects to ensure prompt and proper billing by the Federal Reserve Bank, canceling inactive loans, and enforcing the policy requiring institutions to begin construction within 18 months of loan reservation;

B. Progress and Accomplishments (continued)

-- By continuing a procedure to ensure prompt delivery of notes and bonds to the Federal Reserve Bank; and

-- By conducting more in-depth credit reviews with special conditions when necessary for loan agreements.

o The Department has exceeded the regulatory 10 percent set-aside for historically black colleges and universities each year that it has administered this program.

C. Costs and Benefits

New Loan Commitments: In each of fiscal years 1984 and 1985, $40 million was made available for new loans, and $57.4 million is being committed in FY 1986.

Table 1 shows the distribution of loans for these years by purpose and amount. Loans are financed from the program's revolving fund and require no appropriation of capital. Each year, approximately three-quarters of the available funds are committed for housing construction, and one-quarter is committed for energy conservation projects.

Table 1

LOAN COMMITMENTS OF THE COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM
FY 1984 - FY 1986

Type of Award	Year of Commitment					
	1984		1985		1986	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Housing construction	11	$30,000,000	10	$30,413,000	NA	NA
Energy conservation	18	10,000,000	16	9,587,000	NA	NA
Total	29	$40,000,000	26	$40,000,000	NA	$57,420,000

Source: See E.1.

Indirect or Off-Budget Costs: The Federal Government subsidizes the difference between the average 3 percent interest paid by institutions on their college housing loans and the actual cost of long-term Treasury borrowing (which is the principal source of capital for these loans). Hence, most of this program's cost is off-budget and does not appear as a direct expense. The off-budget cost is estimated to exceed $200 million annually.

Repayment of Treasury and GNMA Borrowing: The entire principal liability ($451.5 million) on GNMA participation certificates, sold to the public in 1967 and 1968 to raise loan capital, was amortized in FY 1985. All available program funds (i.e., loan repayments and other income in excess of new loan volume and program operating costs) are now planned to be used to repay Treasury borrowings. (See Table 2.)

Table 2

AGGREGATE LOAN PORTFOLIO OF THE
COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM
FY 1984 - FY 1986

	1984	1985	1986 (est.)
Selected Assets			
Loans receivable	$2,675,520,000	$2,300,427,000	$2,281,872,000
GNMA trust funds	337,357,000	451,504,000	451,504,000
Selected Liabilities			
Treasury borrowing	2,687,325,000	2,625,325,000	2,584,325,000
GNMA borrowing	451,504,000	451,504,000	451,504,000
Defaulted Loans*	105,561,000	84,456,000	87,461,000
Loan default collections (as of June 30, 1986)			3,334,000

*This amount represents a potential offset against loans receivable.

Sources: Department of Education, Division of Finance, except College Housing Loan Default Collections, for which the source is the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond.

In FY 1986, the major portion of loan repayments and other income is being used to pay program operating costs. These costs are estimated to include the following:

- Interest expenses of $70.0 million on borrowed Treasury funds used to make loans in prior years. (This expense was $68 million in FY 1985.)
- Interest expenses of $28.1 million on GNMA participation certificates, the proceeds of which were also used to make prior-year loans (this is the same amount as in FY 1985.)
- A total of $1.6 million for loan servicing, facilities management, and audit and inspection expenses. (This cost was $258,000 in FY 1985.)

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, FY 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

ANNUAL INTEREST SUBSIDY GRANTS
(CFDA No. 84.001)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title VII, Part C, Section 734, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1132d-3), (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	Indefinite	$25,500,000
1983	"	25,000,000
1984	"	24,500,000
1985	"	18,775,000
1986	"	22,490,000

Purpose: To reduce the cost of private financing for construction, reconstruction, and renovation of academic facilities by paying annual interest subsidy grants over the life of commercially secured loans. Program appropriations are requested in the amount needed to pay these subsidies, which are intended to bring down the interest rate on loans to educational institutions to 3 or 4 percent.

Eligibility: Higher education institutions and agencies empowered by a State to issue bonds on behalf of private institutions of higher education are eligible.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

- The objective for FY 1986 was to meet the Federal commitment to pay interest subsidies on the 612 construction loans remaining in payment status and to make no new commitments to subsidize additional loans.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- All loan subsidy commitments were met in FY 1986 with available appropriated funds and carryover funds. The remaining loan issues for which loan subsidies were negotiated and to which the Department agreed were put into status in FY 1986.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: From FY 1970 through FY 1973, 711 privately secured loans valued at about $1.4 billion in principal amount were approved for Federal interest subsidies. The subsidy payments totaled about $315 million through FY 1986. At the end of FY 1986, 612 of these loans remained in active status, dropping to 605 in FY 1987, as the table shows. Outstanding loan volume under subsidy, as well as the average interest subsidy grant, will decline slightly between FY 1986 and FY 1988.

IMPACT DATA ON ANNUAL INTEREST SUBSIDY GRANTS
ESTIMATED FOR FY 1986 - FY 1988

	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988
Total number of loans approved for subsidy, active, and in pay status	612	605	591
Total number of loans paid off, withdrawn, or otherwise terminated during year	7	14	15
Average amount of interest subsidy grant	$38,500	$38,479	$38,584
Total outstanding volume of loans for which interest subsidies are paid	$1,150,000,000	$1,117,000,000	$1,082,000,000

Source: See E.1.

Program Effectiveness: No studies have been conducted on the overall impact of this program.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, FY 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies are in progress or planned for this program.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

LOANS FOR CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, AND RENOVATION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

(CFDA No. 13.594)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title VII, Part C, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1132d et seq.); Participation Sales Act of 1966 and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act of 1968 (12 U.S.C. 1717[c]) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

		Appropriation	
Fiscal Year	Authorization	Annual	Permanent
1982	$80,000,000	$11,096,000	$37,783,000
1983	80,000,000	20,143,000	134,000
1984	80,000,000	19,846,000	0
1985	80,000,000	14,094,000	0
1986	80,000,000	17,991,000	0

Purpose: To assist higher education institutions in constructing and maintaining academic facilities, the Secretary is authorized to make and insure low-interest loans.

The Department awards loans subject to the following stipulations: (1) not less than 20 percent of the development cost of the facility must be financed from non-Federal sources (this requirement may be waived for schools qualified as developing institutions under HEA Title III); (2) the applicant must have been unable to secure a loan of this size from other sources upon terms and conditions as favorable as the terms and conditions applicable to loans under this program; (3) construction must be undertaken economically; (4) in the case of a project to construct an infirmary or other facility designed to provide primarily outpatient care to students and institutional personnel, no financial assistance will be provided under Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950; (5) the loan must be repaid within 50 years; and (6) the applicant must pay an interest rate of 4 percent.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education and agencies empowered by a State to issue bonds on behalf of private institutions of higher education are eligible for loans.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

In FY 1986, the Department's objectives for this program were to increase the amount of collections on defaulted loans and to improve debt collection efforts.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Principal and interest collections on loans fell from $29.2 million in FY 1985 to an estimated $27.6 million in FY 1986; collections are projected to be $27.1 million in FY 1987.

C. Costs and Benefits

Types of Benefits: The program is authorized for two appropriations: (1) An annual appropriation to pay interest on Treasury loan capital as well as other program operating costs. The Treasury interest rate is reset annually on the basis of the Treasury's borrowing cost for long-term notes and bonds (for FY 1986, this was 10.75 percent). Institutions pay only 3 percent interest on their loans. (2) A permanent appropriation is to pay interest insufficiencies on Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA) participation certificates sold to the public at interest rates averaging about 6 percent.

Program Scope: Through FY 1986, about 660 loans totaling more than $640 million had been awarded (with all but 4 of these loans having been made prior to 1975).

The Congress has appropriated $697.4 million in loan and operating capital and another $57 million to pay interest insufficiencies on participation certificates sold to the public in 1967 and 1968 to raise additional loan capital. Of the $200 million in total certificates sold, $108 million remain outstanding. These certificates will mature in FY 1987 and FY 1988. The Department has already made deposits in GNMA trust funds toward the remaining balance of $80 million (estimated for the close of FY 1986). Investment earnings on these GNMA deposits have been used to finance interest insufficiencies since 1984.

No new construction loans to academic facilities are planned. Prior to FY 1982, the unobligated balance of the revolving loan fund was sufficient to cover the program's annual operating expenses. In 1982, however, this unobligated balance was depleted by new loan activity, and annual appropriations are now required to fund operating deficits.

Program Effectiveness: No studies have been conducted of the overall impact of this program.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, FY 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies are in progress or planned for this program.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

NATIONAL GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.170)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title IX, Part C, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1134h-1134k), (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1985

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1985	Indefinite	$2,500,000
1986	Indefinite	2,393,000

Purpose: To assist graduate students pursuing doctoral degrees in selected fields in the arts, humanities, and social sciences. Fellowships are awarded on the basis of merit as well as need. Fellowships are distributed among currently entering graduate students, currently enrolled graduate students, and students at the dissertation level.

II. FY 1986 Program Information and Analysis
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objective

Awards are intended to meet the following objective:

- To provide incentives for promising scholars to obtain terminal degrees and enter academic professions. The statute further specifies that fellowships shall be granted to students of superior abilities selected on the basis of demonstrated achievement and exceptional promise.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- In FY 1985, 85 awards (for 30 months each) were made to students enrolled in 37 graduate schools in the United States. In FY 1986, 211 awards (for 12 months each) were made to students in 66 graduate schools in the United States. These awards will be renewable (funds permitting) for up to 48 months total.

C. Costs and Benefits

The National Graduate Fellowship Program (NGFP), to date, has awarded 296 fellowships at a cost of $4,893,000 to graduate students in the arts, humanities, and social sciences. The maximum award is $16,000 for stipend and $6,000 for tuition. Participating institutions accept the $6,000 as payment in full for tuition. However, because since the program is need-based, the average award is less than the maximum amount of $16,000.

The distribution of awards, according to NGFP Board guidelines, must be as follows:

- At least 15 percent in the arts,
- At least 15 percent in the social sciences,
- A maximum of 70 percent in the humanities.

Among the recipients of awards to date approximately 60 percent have been men, and 40 percent women. Data on distribution by race are not collected.

Program Effectiveness: Because the program is only in its second year of operation, measurements of effectiveness are not available.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are in progress or planned.

Contacts for Further Information:

Program Operations: Dr. Allen Cissell, (202) 732-4415

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

CARL D. PERKINS SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.176)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part E, as amended by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1119d to 1119d-8) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1986	$20,000,000	$9,570,000

Purpose: This newly authorized program is intended to encourage and enable outstanding high school graduates to study to become elementary and secondary school teachers.

Eligibility: All States are eligible to receive Federal formula grants based on population to provide scholarships to potential teachers.

To be eligible for these scholarships, students must have ranked in the top 10 percent of their high school graduating class and must sign an agreement to teach in an elementary or secondary school following graduation from college. Scholars must teach two years for each year of assistance received. If teaching is performed in an area that has teacher shortages, scholarship recipients are required to teach for only one year. In addition, States are responsible for establishing criteria for the selection of scholars, such as financial need, grade point average, and expression of interest in teaching as demonstrated in an essay written by the applicant. To continue to receive scholarship payments, a student must maintain satisfactory progress in a full-time course of study leading to teacher certification.

The chief elected official in each State designates either the State agency that administers the State Student Incentive Grant Program or the State agency that serves as a guarantee agency for the Guaranteed Student Loan Program to administer the program. Individual scholarship recipients are selected by a seven-member statewide panel, appointed by the chief elected official in each State, or by an existing grant agency or panel designated by the chief State elected official in the State and approved by the Secretary of Education.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

- The objective of this program in FY 1986 was to provide grants to States to enable them to make scholarship awards to outstanding high school graduates to encourage and enable them to pursue teaching careers at the elementary or secondary level.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The Department published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for the program on June 4, 1986, and a Notice of Closing Date for filing State applications for FY 1986 participation in the program on June 9, 1986. State allotments amounting to the full $9,570,000 appropriation are to be used for scholarships for academic year 1986-87. Final regulations were published in the Federal Register on October 6, 1986.

C. Costs and Benefits

This section is not applicable to this program, because it was not in operation in program year 1985-86.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

None.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Neil C. Nelson (202) 245-9720

Program Studies : Jay Noell, (202) 245-8877

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

TERRITORIAL TEACHER TRAINING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM-- PROJECT GRANTS TO TERRITORIAL JURISDICTIONS (CFDA No. 84.124)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education Amendments of 1978, Title XV, Part C, Section 1525, P.L. 95-561, as reauthorized by the Education Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-511 (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$2,000,000	$ 960,000
1983	2,000,000	960,000
1984	2,000,000	1,000,000
1985	2,000,000	2,000,000
1986	2,000,000	1,913,613

Purpose: To provide assistance for teacher training in schools in Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands through grants to State education agencies (SEAs) in each territory.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objective for this program continued to be the distribution of grants to upgrade the skills and capacities of teachers in the territories.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The Department awarded five grants ranging from $125,000 to $880,000 for school year 1986-87.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: In academic year 1985-86, about 2,000 teachers received training at an average cost of about $500 per teacher.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available on improvements in teacher skills or capacities resulting from training activities supported by this program.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

There have been no Federal studies of the program.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of this program are planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Haroldie Spriggs, (202) 357-6143

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES--GRANTS TO STATE LIBRARY AGENCIES (CDFA No. 84.034)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), Title I, P.L. 91-600, as amended (20 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$65,000,000	$60,000,000
1983	65,000,000	60,000,000
1984	65,000,000	65,000,000
1985	75,000,000	75,000,000 1/
1986	80,000,000	71,774,000 1/

Purposes: To establish, extend, and improve public library services to areas and populations that lack these services or have inadequate services; to make public library services accessible to persons who, by reason of distance, residence, handicap, age, literacy level, limited English-speaking proficiency, or other disadvantage, are unable to benefit from regularly available public library services; to help libraries serve as community information referral centers; to strengthen the capacity of the State library to meet the library needs of the people of the State; to support and expand the services of major urban resource libraries and metropolitan libraries that serve as national or regional resource centers; and to strengthen the capacity of libraries to keep up with rapidly changing information technologies.

Eligibility: All State library administrative agencies are eligible to apply for LSCA Title I grants. Besides the 50 States, this group includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Guam.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS [Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department had three principal objectives for this program:

- To encourage the extension of public library services to underserved or unserved counties and small towns;
- To increase the capacity of State library administrative agencies to provide statewide public library services; and
- To encourage innovative public library services to persons who have limited English-speaking proficiency, are physically handicapped, are institutionalized in State facilities, are elderly, or are disadvantanged.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- State annual reports indicated that 75 percent of the program funds were used for institutional support and the remaining 25 percent to provide public library services to selected population groups.

- Federal support for public libraries accounts for less than 5 percent of their total funding. It is estimated that 96 percent of the Nation's population has access to public library services.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Since the program's inception 30 years ago, more than $1 billion in program funds have been spent to increase access to public libraries and to improve basic library educational and information services to special population groups. The unduplicated numbers of persons served (as reported in State annual reports) in selected population groups in FY 1986 were reported by the States as follows:

Category	Numbers Reached
Limited English-speaking proficiency	3,000,000
Physically handicapped	1,000,000
Persons institutionalized in correctional environments, etc.	900,000
Elderly	900,000
Total	5,800,000

Library services include radio readings for the blind; classes in English as a second language; materials to help mentally retarded persons cope with public transportation, job hunting, ordering in a restaurant, and similar activities; book collections at senior citizen centers; books-by-mail programs for rural residents; and literacy programs for functionally illiterate adults.

Program Effectiveness: No new data are available (see FY 1983 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

Technical Amendments to LSCA were passed on November 22, 1985, with final regulations published on May 21, 1986.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. LSCA Title I Grant Reports

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Robert Klassen, (202) 357-6303

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. Under P.L. 98-480, the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1984, 1.5 percent of the amount appropriated for Titles I, II, and III is used for grants to Indian tribes and 0.5 percent is used for grants to Hawaiian natives, under Title IV (Library Services for Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives) (see Chapter 609).

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION--GRANTS TO STATE LIBRARY AGENCIES (CFDA No. 84.035)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), Title III, P.L. 91-600, as amended (20 U.S.C. 351 et seq.)(expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$15,000,000	$11,520,000
1983	15,000,000	11,520,000
1984	15,000,000	15,000,000
1985	20,000,000	18,000,000 1/
1986	25,000,000	17,226,000 1/

Purposes: The purposes of this program are to establish, develop, operate, and expand local, regional, or interstate networks of libraries, including school libraries, academic libraries, public libraries, special libraries, and information centers. These networks are designed to coordinate library resources and to improve services for special clientele.

Eligibility: All State library administrative agencies are eligible to apply for Title III grants. Besides the 50 States, this group includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Guam. The States are also required to develop a statewide resource sharing plan.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To encourage the establishment and expansion of networks of libraries and to promote coordination of informational resources among school libraries, public libraries, academic and special libraries, and information centers.

- To monitor the initial development of statewide resource-sharing plans to address the issues of bibliographic access to computerized data bases and other communication systems for information exchange; to develop delivery systems for exchanging materials among libraries; to project computer and other technological needs for resource sharing; and to analyze and evaluate the States' library resource-sharing needs.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- More than 50 percent of program funds were used to continue support of computerized bibliographic data bases, both for current materials and for retrospective conversion of older materials. Generally, these funds are used by States and local libraries to establish links with major national bibliographic data bases.
- Because of the cost-sharing benefits derived from these projects, 22 States now provide State aid for public libraries and multitype library systems and networks (any combination of school, academic, or special libraries); these 22 States appropriated about $90 million in FY 1986.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: Since 1967 when this program was initiated, more than $100 million in Federal funds have been expended for projects that link libraries through telecommunication systems to data bases, for other resource-sharing projects not linked to automation, and for training library personnel to handle resource sharing and the technological advances in data collection and transmission.

Activities at the State and local public library levels are intended to improve public access to educational and informational services by libraries. Typical projects include installing improved rapid communications systems to link libraries with microcomputers; improving materials delivery systems; production of location tools such as computer-based lists of library holdings; computer-based information retrieval and processing systems; and training of personnel for these activities.

Program Effectiveness: No new data are available (see FY 1983 Annual Evaluation Report for the latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

Technical amendments to LSCA were passed on November 22, 1985, with final regulations published on May 21, 1986.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. LSCA Title III Grant Reports.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Robert Klassen, (202) 357-6303

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. Under P.L. 98-480, the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1984, 1.5 percent of the amount appropriated for Titles I, II, and III is used for grants to Indian tribes and 0.5 percent is used for grants to Hawaiian natives, under Title IV (Library Services for Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives)(see Chapter 609).

LIBRARY LITERACY PROGRAM--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO STATE AND LOCAL PUBLIC LIBRARIES
(CFDA No. 84-167)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), Title VI, P.L. 98-480 (20 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) (expires September 30, 1988).

Funding Since 1986 1/

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1986	$5,000,000	$4,785,000

Purpose: To provide grants to State and local public libraries for the support of literacy programs.

Eligibility: All State library administrative agencies and local public libraries.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department of Education's objectives for this program were as follows:

- To award grants to State public libraries to coordinate and plan literacy programs and to arrange for the training of librarians and volunteers to carry out such programs; and
- To award grants to local public libraries to promote the use of the voluntary services of individuals, agencies, and organizations in providing literacy programs; to acquire library materials for literacy programs; and to support the use of library facilities for literacy programs.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- A total of 22 grants were awarded to State public libraries to train librarians and volunteers in their states through workshops and seminars, to initiate and coordinate statewide literacy programs, and to provide technical assistance to librarians in their states to conduct literacy projects.
- A total of 218 grants were awarded to local public libraries to acquire literacy materials, to recruit and train volunteers to be tutors, and to promote their literacy projects to reach the illiterate population in their communities.

C. Cost and Benefits

Program Scope: The FY 1986 appropriation of $4,785,000 resulted in the award of 22 grants to State public libraries, totaling about $513,095, and 218 grants to local public libraries, totaling about $4,247,982. The average grant award was $19,838 (grant awards cannot exceed $25,000).

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operation: Frank A. Stevens, (202) 357-6315

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. FY 1986 is the first year of program operation.

LIBRARY CAREER TRAINING--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO AND CONTRACTS WITH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND LIBRARY ORGANIZATIONS OR AGENCIES (CFDA No. 84.036)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title II-B, P.L. 89-329 as amended by the Education Amendments of 1980, P.L. 96-374, Sections 201, 202, and 222, by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, and by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1021, 1022, and 1032) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation
1982	$ 1,200,000	$640,000
1983	1,200,000	640,000
1984	1,200,000	640,000
1985	35,000,000	640,000
1986	35,000,000	612,000

Purpose: To assist institutions of higher education and library organizations and agencies in training persons in the principles and practices of librarianship and information science, including new techniques of information transfer and communication technology.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education and library organizations or agencies.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

The Department's principal objective for FY 1986 was to increase opportunities for members of underrepresented groups to obtain training and retraining in librarianship, including training beyond the master's degree level.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The 1986 appropriation of $612,000 for this program supported 68 fellowships aimed primarily at upgrading the professional skills of women and members of minority groups. The fellowships were distributed as follows: doctoral study, 14; post-master's study, 3; master's study, 51.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: From 1973 through 1985, 1,077 (69.9 percent) of the 1,540 awards went to members of minority groups. Women received 1,174 of the fellowships (76.2 percent).

In FY 1985, the most recent year for which data are available, 62 women and 10 men received fellowships. Forty-five of the awards were to minorities (37 to blacks, 5 to Hispanics, and 3 to Asian-Americans).

Program Effectiveness: The Historical Survey of Higher Education Act, Title II-B Fellowships, 1965-1982, funded in 1983 under a grant from the Higher Education Act, Title II-B Research and Demonstration Program was completed in July, 1985. The study indicated that one-third of all recipients of doctoral fellowships are teaching or have taught in library and information science education programs. Almost one-half of this group are senior faculty, and one-third are deans, directors, associate deans, and associate directors. According to this study and annual performance reports, recipients had little difficulty in getting jobs.

According to responses from 83 percent of the FY 1984 grantees, 78.2 percent of this group has obtained full-time employment by the summer of 1984 (the remainder were still in school). The places of employment of the fellows after graduation were as follows:

Public libraries	12.7%
School libraries	9.1%
Special libraries	16.4%
Academic libraries	30.9%
Other	9.1%

Since the program began in 1965, grantees have awarded 1,072 doctoral, 243 post-master's, 2,737 master's, 16 bachelor's, and 53 associate's fellowships and 77 traineeships for a total of 4,198.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. The program files contain narrative and fiscal reports, personal interviews, and professional literature.

2. Historical Survey of Higher Education Act, Title II-B Fellowships, 1965-1982, 1985.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frank A. Stevens, (202) 357-6315

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. Authorization for HEA Title II, Part B, Sections 222, 223, 224.

LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATIONS-- DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO AND CONTRACTS WITH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OTHER ELIGIBLE AGENCIES, INSTITUTIONS, AND ORGANIZATIONS
(CFDA No. 84.039)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title II-B, as amended by the Education Amendments of 1980, P.L. 96-374, Section 201, by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, and by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1021, 1022, and 1033) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation
1982	$ 1,200,000	$240,000
1983	1,200,000	240,000
1984	1,200,000	240,000
1985	35,000,000	360,000
1986	35,000,000	345,000

Purpose: To make grants to and contracts with institutions of higher education and other public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations for research or demonstration projects related to the improvement of libraries, or librarian training and information technology, and for the dissemination of information derived from such projects.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education, public and private agencies, institutions, or organizations.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the principal objectives for the programs were to monitor three ongoing contracts and to award three new contracts that will (1) update a study on public library services to the aging; (2) complete The Cooperative System for Public Library Data Curriculum: A Pilot Project, which was funded in FY 1985; and (3) begin a major study of current and future issues in the library and information science field.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The final report for the project Diffusion of Innovation in Library and Information Science was received and accepted. This project identified innovations developed and adopted for use in library and information science, traced the development of such innovations, developed a model for planned diffusion, and recommended options for building a diffusion network.

- The demonstration project Leadership Training, Guidance, and Direction for the Improvement of Public Library and Information Services to Native American Tribes will be completed in December 1986. A sample of 73 American Indian tribes indicated the need for training and assistance in such areas as locating funding sources; establishing a library; developing goals; doing general planning; ordering and processing books, other materials, and equipment; and writing proposals. Several workshops and technical assistance via phone, correspondence, and face-to-face discussions addressed these needs for representative tribes.

- The Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection: A Pilot Project has successfully involved 17 States in the development of a common data core. Several other States are planning to revise their data collection methods as well.

- The project Accreditation: A Way Ahead was completed. As a result of the project, the American Library Association agreed to commit funds to set up an Interassociation Advisory Committee on Accreditation including representatives of the American Association of Law Libraries, the Medical Library Association, and the American Society for Information Science.

- The project Libraries and Literacy Education, awarded to the University of Wisconsin, Madison, began operation in January 1986. It will update an earlier study on the role of libraries in literacy education and project an expanded role for libraries in literacy education, will identify at least six exemplary literacy programs conducted by libraries, and will assess the application and effectiveness of new technology in such literacy activities.

The Department awarded the following projects:

- Redesigning Library Research: Anticipating the Future is a study of current and future issues in the library and information science field. The study will develop a set of research topics identified by national and international experts as important issues expected to influence library and information science in the next few decades.

- National Survey of Public Library Services to the Aging: Update 1986 The purposes of this survey are (1) to update and amplify the 1971 National Survey; (2) to identify and measure variables in library services for older adults, ascertain problem areas, and suggest modifications; and (3) to sponsor a symposium on "Public Library Services for Older Adults."

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: During FY 1986, program activities continued to generate awareness of library issues. The project Accreditation: A Way Ahead, was a major focus of the annual American Library Association meeting of the Committee on Accreditation. The project Libraries and Literacy Education is of interest to a number of libraries planning literacy education programs. The Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection: A Pilot Project has proved that a common core of data can be developed for use by States.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

D. Highlights and Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operation: Frank A. Stevens, (202) 357-6315

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. Authorization for HEA II-B, Section 222, 223, and 224.

STRENGTHENING RESEARCH LIBRARY RESOURCES--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO MAJOR RESEARCH LIBRARIES
(CFDA No. 84.091)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title II-C, as amended by the Education Amendments of 1980, P.L. 96-374, Section 201, by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, and by P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1021) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$ 6,000,000	$5,760,000
1983	6,000,000	6,000,000
1984	6,000,000	6,000,000
1985	15,000,000	6,000,000
1986	15,000,000	5,742,000

Purpose: To promote high-quality research and education throughout the United States by providing grants to help major research libraries maintain and strengthen their collections and make their holdings available to other libraries and to individual researchers and scholars outside their primary clientele.

Eligibility: Major research libraries are eligible to apply for program funding. Major research libraries may be public or private nonprofit institutions; institutions of higher education; independent research libraries; and State or public libraries.

Applicants must demonstrate that they have broadly based collections that make significant contributions to higher education and research, have recognized national or international significance for scholarly research, and contain material not widely available but in substantial demand by researchers and scholars not connected with the applicant institution.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department of Education's objectives for this program were as follows:

o To increase access to research materials;

o To preserve unique materials;

- o To help research libraries acquire distinctive, unique, and specialized materials;
- o To promote cooperative activity among institutions; and
- o To extend benefits to as many institutions as possible, including previously unfunded institutions.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o Six new grantees were among the 38 primary grantees funded in FY 1986; if institutions that benefit under cooperative projects are counted, 44 research libraries were supported.
- o Thirty-three of the 38 grantees chose bibliographic control as the principal area of project activity; they added new entries to national data bases, thus making additional research materials accessible.
- o Twenty grantees used Title II-C funds for advanced preservation techniques to make rare and unique materials more available.
- o Three grantees acquired specialized materials and entered the bibliographic records into national data bases, making additional unique materials accessible and available to researchers and scholars.
- o Three institutions promoted cooperative activities by administering joint projects for six additional institutions.

C. Cost and Benefits

Program Scope: The FY 1986 appropriation of $5,742,000 supported 38 grants. The size of the grants ranged from $40,350 to $404,776, with an average of $151,105. All geographic areas of the country were represented. The distribution of grants by type of institution was as follows: libraries at institutions of higher education, 28; independent research libraries, 4; public libraries, 2; museums, 3; and historical societies, 1.

Information on major activities includes the following:

- o Implementation of a National Bibliographic Network. Systematic sharing of bibliographic data facilitates access to rare materials and, by eliminating duplicative efforts in cataloging and indexing, saves thousands of hours. In FY 1986, 77 percent of the total funds awarded ($4,429,374) were used for bibliographic control.

- o Physical Preservation of Rare Materials. Poor physical condition limits access and use of rare materials, and progressive deterioration may eventually result in the total loss of fragile, rare materials. Increasing awareness of the importance of preservation to the research community caused many preservation projects to be submitted; 20 percent ($1,122,409) of the total funds were awarded for various preservation activities.

- o Development of Specialized Collections. Centralized collections of rare or specialized materials facilitate research. In FY 1986, three grantees chose to intensify collection development by adding books, manuscripts, microfilm, journals, and maps on such diverse areas as English-language poetry since World War II: imperial Russian political, social, and literacy journals; and continental European renaissance history and literature, accounting for the remaining 3 percent ($190,217) of the funds.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

D. Highlights of Activities

An amendment to the regulations governing this program, published in the Federal Register on November 22, 1985, permits a grant recipient to retain eligibility for four succeeding fiscal years. During this period only the information required by Section 778.32 of the program regulations to establish the quality of the project is necessary for competition. This amendment significantly reduces the paperwork burden and work hours on the part of the applicant, and it reduces the work hours of the review panel and the program staff--a cost-saving measure for the Department of Education.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frank Stevens, (202) 357-6315

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

PUBLIC LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION--GRANTS TO STATE LIBRARY AGENCIES
(CFDA No. 84.154)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), Title II, P.L. 91-600, as amended (20 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since 1983

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1983	$50,000,000	$50,000,000 1/
1984	0	0
1985	50,000,000	25,000,000 2/, 3/
1986	50,000,000	21,533,000 2/, 3/

Purpose: The purpose of this program is to provide the Federal share of funds for the construction of new public library buildings and for the acquisition, expansion, remodeling, or alteration of existing public library buildings; for the initial equipment for any such buildings; or any combination of the activities included in the LSCA definition of "construction" (including architects' fees and land acquisition).

Eligibility: All State library administrative agencies are eligible to apply for Title II funds; also eligible are the agencies in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Guam.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department of Education had two principal objectives for this program:

- To complete the funding of public library construction projects that were supported by the Emergency Jobs Act and designed to create jobs for unemployed workers in areas of high unemployment; and

- To provide strategic technical assistance to State library administrative agencies after an absence of Federal public library construction funds funds between 1974 and 1982.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- In FY 1986, 270 construction projects were funded with more than $15 million in LSCA Title II funds.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: LSCA Title II funds supported projects for new buildings, additions to existing libraries, general remodeling of older buildings, special remodeling for accessibility to handicapped persons, energy conservation, and the housing of computers for library users.

Program Effectiveness: No new information (see the FY 1984 Annual Evaluation Report for the latest information).

D. Highlights of Activities

Technical amendments to the LSCA were passed on November 22, 1985, and final regulations published on May 21, 1986.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. LSCA Title II Grant Awards.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS

[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Robert Klassen, (202) 357-6303

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. The Emergency Jobs Act, P.L. 98-8, appropriated $50 million in FY 1983 for public library construction to be administered under the authority of the Library Services and Construction Act, Title II, program for public library construction. No time limit was put on the expenditure of funds.

2. Under the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1984, 1.5 percent of the amount appropriated for Titles I, II, and III is used for making grants to Indian tribes and 0.5 percent is used for making grants to Hawaiian natives, under Title IV (Library Services for Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives)(see Chapter 609).

3. There is no time limit for the expenditure of construction funds.

LIBRARY SERVICES FOR INDIAN TRIBES AND HAWAIIAN NATIVES--BASIC AND SPECIAL PROJECTS DISCRETIONARY GRANTS
(CFDA No. 84.163)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), Title IV, P.L. 91-600, as amended (20 U.S.C. 351) (expires September 30, 1989).

Funding Since FY 1985

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation
1985	-	$2,360,000 2/
1986	-	2,211,000 3/

Purposes: (1) To promote the extension of public library services to Hawaiian natives and to Indian tribes living on or near reservations; (2) to encourage the establishment and expansion of tribal library programs; and (3) to promote the improvement of administration and implementation of library services for Indian tribes and Hawaiian natives by providing funds to establish new programs and to support ongoing ones.

Eligibility: Eligibility is restricted to federally recognized Indian tribes submitting applications for library projects to serve Indians living on or near a reservation, and organizations primarily serving and representing Hawaiian natives that are recognized by the Governor of Hawaii. (For purposes of this program, "Indian tribe" means an Indian tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community certified by the Secretary of the Interior as eligible for Federal special programs and services.)

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department of Education's objectives for this program were as follows:

- To award basic grants for one or more of the following purposes: to increase awareness of tribal library needs; to train or pay the salaries of tribal library personnel; to purchase library materials; to support special library programs; to increase access to library services; to construct, renovate, or remodel library buildings; and
- To award special project grants that will enhance and supplement the aforementioned purposes.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o **Basic Grants**: The majority of the 185 tribes and villages that received Basic Grants chose to purchase library materials and to pay the salaries of tribal library personnel. One Basic Grant of $552,750 was made to Hawaiian natives to improve the delivery of outreach services to special populations.

- o **Special Project Grants**: One Special Project grantee plans to build a new library facility. The remaining grantees will pursue activities that include the use of bookmobiles, the building of additions to existing facilities, the training of tribal members as library personnel, the performance of needs assessments, the computerization of library resources, and the strengthening of archival collections.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope: The FY 1986 appropriation of $2,211,000 was used to fund 185 Basic Grants to Indian tribes, totaling $606,177; 1 Basic Grant of $552,750 to Hawaiian natives; and 17 Special Project Grants to Indian tribes totaling $1,052,073, with grants ranging from less than $1,000 to more than $160,000.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available.

D. Highlights of Activities

Under Special Project Grants:

- o The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribe will have completed by September 30, 1986, the construction of a 16,800-square-foot new public library serving a population of approximately 20,000 on the Flathead Indian Reservation.

- o The Navajo Nation is operating two bookmobiles serving 100,000 previously unserved persons.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Frank A. Stevens, (202) 357-3615

Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. 1.5 percent of the appropriation for LSCA Titles I, II, and III is set aside for Indian tribes and 0.5 percent of the appropriation for LSCA Titles I, II, and III is set aside for Hawaiian natives.
2. $1,770,000 for Indian tribes, $590,000 for Hawaiian natives.
3. $1,658,250 for Indian tribes, $552,750 for Hawaiian natives.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH
(No CFDA Number)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), Section 405, as amended by Title XIV of the Higher Education Amendments (HEA) of 1986, P.L. 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 1221e) (expires September 30, 1991).

Funding Since 1982: 1/

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$130,000,000	$53,389,000
1983	145,000,000	55,614,000
1984	160,000,000	48,231,000
1985	175,000,000	51,231,000
1986	--	20,483,000

Purposes: To help solve or alleviate the problems of American education and promote its reform and renewal; advance the practice of education as an art, science, and profession; strengthen the scientific and technological foundations of education; and build an effective educational research and development system.

The Office of Research, which is a component of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) supports fundamental and applied research at every level of education on such topics as the processes of teaching and learning reading and effective schooling. Major programs include the following:

- The National Research Centers, which are responsible for conducting long-term research and development in areas of national concern and for disseminating their findings and products nationally. Each of the 14 centers focuses on a particular topic.
- Analyses of and research on key topics in education to draw attention of educators and policymakers to research findings, stimulate scholars to address important gaps in knowledge, and support research designed to fill in such gaps. Besides individual research, activities in FY 1986 included the National Assessment of Chapter 1, the U.S.-Japan study, and two Higher Education Assessment studies.
- The Fellowship Program, under which the Secretary could award fellowships of 4 to 12 months each to scholars, researchers, statisticians, and others engaged in educational research or research-related activities to conduct projects related to the improvement of education.

Additional activities include field-initated grants, in-house research and analysis and the Small-Business Innovative Research Program, which encourages business to come up with innovative programs to improve the teaching and learning processes in American education.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

Each Office of Research program had specific objectives for FY 1986 that are described in this section.

A. Objectives

National Research Centers

- o To award contracts for 11 new centers and to continue support for 4 ongoing centers.

Analyses and Research

The major analyses and research under way in FY 1986 included the following:

National Assessment of Chapter 1

- o To complete the first two Reports to Congress and
- o To complete all field work for the assessment, including the two national surveys and the five case studies.

U.S.-Japan Study

- o To conduct advisory committee meetings and working conferences and to produce commissioned papers and a report to support the goals of the Department of Education and of the U.S.-Japan Friendship Committee, which provides funding for the study.

Higher Education and Adult Learning

- o To develop plans for workshops on higher education assessment to be conducted in FY 1987 through the Center for Postsecondary Teaching and Learning in cooperation with the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education,
- o To hold a conference and to commission research papers on adult learning and literacy,
- o To continue dissemination activities in assessment of higher education,
- o To hold a competition and award contracts to conduct research on the effects of differential course work on college student learning,
- o To hold a competition and award contracts to develop models of indicators of college student learning in the disciplines, and
- o To examine the careers of liberal arts majors.

Schools and School Professionals

- To develop and manage the award documents for the establishment and monitoring of a Center for Research on Teachers and Teaching in the School Context;
- To plan and develop an activity for the systematic review and consolidation of the research base on school principals;
- To plan, develop, and carry out research on the management and organization at the school district level;
- To collaborate with the Program for Improvement of Practice and Information Services Divisions on the writing and publication of a handbook on school principalship; and
- To support and continue research on teacher incentives, rewards, career satisfaction, certification, and bureaucratization.

Education and Society

- To sponsor conferences to set research agendas or synthesize current research on issues related to education and society,
- To sponsor a cost-sharing grants competition, and
- To provide services to State legislators and staff on current and emerging education issues.

Learning and Instruction Research

- To stimulate research on reasoning and on ways of teaching reasoning skills,
- To make an award to one of four applicants for the Reading Research and Education Center's cooperative agreement competition,
- To support field-initiated studies on reading and literacy to improve knowledge about acquiring and developing the necessary skills for a more literate American society,
- To prepare a comprehensive catalog of teacher-testing programs, and
- To cosponsor programs on research on teaching with the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities and the National Science Foundation.

Fellowship Program

- To develop regulations and
- To sponsor fellows.

Other

- o To publish regulations for educational research grants.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

National Research Centers

- o The Office of Research awarded contracts for 10 new national research centers for the study of writing; learning; student testing, evaluation, and standards; postsecondary learning and teaching; teacher education; education and employment; effective elementary schools; effective secondary schools; postsecondary management and governance; and State and local policy. The Office of Research also continued to support four centers on educational technology, language education and research, reading, and teaching. 2/

Analyses and Research

.National Assessment of Chapter 1

- o The first Report to Congress, Poverty, Achievement, and the Distribution of Compensatory Education Services, was completed in FY 1986. The second Report to Congress to review information on the effectiveness of the Chapter 1 program was scheduled for completion in the autumn of 1986.

- o All field work has been completed for two national surveys and five case studies. The two national surveys are (1) a district survey of more than 2,000 Chapter 1 coordinators which provides information on administration, program design, targeting, parent involvement, evaluation practices, and program coordination; and (2) a school survey of the services provided to Chapter 1 students in 1,200 public and private elementary and secondary schools. The school survey provides information on the subjects taught, the amount of services provided, coordination between Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers, and grouping practices.

  The five case studies will provide information on the administration of the Chapter 1 program at the State and local levels, program design, resource allocation among schools, student selection, and services provided to students.

U.S.-Japan Study

- o The study has produced 19 commissioned papers, 2 advisory committee meetings, and 3 working conferences. A comprehensive report for general audiences was scheduled for completion in December 1986; a larger, more technical report is due for completion by early 1988.

Higher Education and Adult Learning

- o Plans were developed for topics to be discussed at the workshops on higher education assessment, including how to construct and utilize assessment instruments; and how to train faculty to score criterion-referenced assessments in the disciplines; how to gather, analyze, and use assessment data on entering freshmen in the placement and academic advisement process; how to develop and operate assessment centers on the corporate model; and how to perform secondary analysis of assessment data for purposes of program and institutional evaluation.

- Three experts were commissioned to produce papers synthesizing research in the areas of adult learning and development theories. In addition, a 2-day conference was held to assist with a research agenda.
- A study was commissioned on the influence of different course-taking patterns on improvements in the "general learned abilities" of college students. The study looks at the relationships between improvements in general learned abilities and the knowledge and learning paradigms inherent in the course-taking patterns.
- A grant competition was held to develop models of indicators of college student learning in major disciplines and fields.
- Two reports were published: From Reports to Response and Assessment in American Higher Education.
- Two conferences were held: The Conference of State Higher Education Leaders and the National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education.

Schools and School Professionals

- A Request for Proposals for a study of teaching in the context of the middle school was prepared.
- A first draft of a handbook on school principalship was completed.
- Final reports from two teacher-incentive studies were delivered and four additional papers were commissioned.
- A national conference on discipline in the school was planned and managed.
- The first draft of a manuscript on school district management was completed.
- A national conference of researchers and practitioners concerned with teaching and teachers was conducted.

Education and Society

- Six conferences were held to set research agendas or synthesize or analyze current research by the use of commissioned papers. These conferences focused on the following educational and societal issues: (1) student discipline strategies (research agenda and commissioned papers); (2) business involvement in education reform (commissioned papers); (3) magnet schools (commissioned papers); (4) assessment of the impact of television on education (research agenda and commissioned papers); (5) prevention of drug and alcohol abuse (research agenda); and (6) understanding low-income, low-performing schools (research agenda and commissioned papers).

- A contract was signed with the National Conference of State Legislatures to operate a cost-sharing grant competition, prepare briefs on issues, and provide information services to State legislators and staff on current and emerging education issues.

Learning and Instruction Research

- Preparation began for a joint conference with the Center for the Study of Learning on reasoning, to be held at the Center in March 1987.
- Four applications were evaluated for the Reading Research and Education Center's cooperative agreement competition.
- A comprehensive catalog of teacher-testing programs was begun. This work includes review and analysis of the literature pertaining to teacher testing.
- Collaboration was begun with the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities and the National Science Foundation, which will cosponsor a number of programs of research on teaching in the arts, literature, history, science, and mathematics. Awards will be announced in the summer of 1987.

Fellowship Program

- Draft regulations were developed for publication in 1987.
- In FY 1986, OERI awarded $240,000 to seven fellows.

Other

- Regulations for educational research grants were published.

C. Costs and Benefits

The Research Centers were last assessed in FY 1983 (see the FY 1985 Annual Evaluation Report for information.) No information on benefits of the other programs is available.

The costs in FY 1986 for the Office of Research programs are listed below:

Research Centers	$16,844,000
National Assessment of Chapter 1	1,481,000
Higher Education Studies	265,000
State Legislative Reform	200,000
Small-Business Innovation Research Program	363,000
Field-Initiated Studies	478,000
Learning About Computers	107,000
Teacher Incentives	42,000
OERI Fellows Program	237,000
Conference, Commissioned Papers, Agendas, and Dissemination	343,000
Other	123,000
Total	$20,483,000

D. Highlights of Activities

Effective October 27, 1985, OERI was reorganized in order to improve the quality of education research and statistics. In planning the reorganization, the Secretary sought advice from leading scholars, associations, and experts both within and outside the Department of Education, as well as from Members of Congress.

There are five program units within the new organization: the Office of Research, Center for Statistics, Programs for the Improvement of Practice, Information Services, and Library Programs.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. U.S. Department of Education. Poverty, Achievement and the Distribution of Compensatory Education Services, Washington, D.C., 1986.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS [Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies of the Office of Research are planned.

Contacts for Further Information:

Program Operations: Sally Kilgore, (202) 357-6079
Program Studies : Ricky Takai, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. Funding prior to FY 1986 is for the National Institute of Education (NIE). Funding for FY 1986 is for the Office of Research only, which contains a subset of the programs that were contained in NIE.

2. The Center for Teacher Quality and Effectiveness was not funded because no acceptable proposal was submitted.

SECRETARY'S DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM--DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
(CFDA Nos. 84.122, 84.073, and 84.123)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981, Section 583(a) as amended, P.L. 97-35 (20 U.S.C. 3851) (expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1983

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1983	1/	$28,765,000
1984	1/	28,765,000
1985	1/	31,909,000
1986	1/	27,797,000

Purpose: To support projects designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children or to improve elementary and secondary education consistent with the purposes of the ECIA. Funded projects must relate to the purpose of ECIA and consist of one more of the following activities: (1) provide a national source for gathering and disseminating information on the effectiveness of programs to meet the needs of persons served by ECIA; (2) carry out research and demonstrations; (3) improve the training of teachers and other instructional personnel; and (4) provide assistance to State educational agencies and local educational agencies in the implementation of programs with the ECIA.

The Secretary's Discretionary Program assisted programs in three categories: (1) programs mandated by the authorizing statute and by P.L. 98-312 (Arts in Education, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education, Inexpensive Book Distribution, and Law-Related Education) (2) other congressionally directed activities (National Diffusion Network and of the ECIA Chapter 1 Assessment), and (3) special initiatives undertaken by the Department.

(1) Statutorily Mandated Programs

These programs are described individually in the Annual Evaluation Report: "Arts in Education" in Chapter 117, "Inexpensive Book Distribution" in Chapter 118, and "Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education" in Chapter 114, and "Law-Related Education" in Chapter 119.

(2) Congressional Directives

Under the National Diffusion Network (NDN), organizations that have developed products or practices certified by the Department's Joint Dissemination

Review Panel and have NDN grants disseminate information about those efforts and provide training as Developer-Demonstrators to educational personnel at new sites throughout the Nation. Agencies help local educators install the certified products or practices through support from State Facilitator grants. Both types of grants are awarded competitively and may last as long as 4 years, depending on performance and availability of funds. Contracts are also awarded competitively and for varying lengths of time for organizations to provide technical assistance to NDN grantees and to identify and assess promising practices. The Secretary's Discretionary Program provided $10.2 million for NDN in FY 1986, including the elementary school recognition program, funded in alternate years with the secondary school recognition program.

As for the evaluation of the ECIA Chapter 1 Program, the Secretary's Discretionary Fund provided about $450,000 for this purpose in FY 1986. (See Chapter 101 of this report).

(3) The Secretary's Special Initiatives

Special initiatives in FY 1986 included a field-initiated grant competition to fund research, demonstration, dissemination and related activities on such topics as teacher training, school improvement, and gifted and talented programs. The Secretary's Discretionary Program provided approximately $1.4 million for these projects in FY 1986.

In addition, the Secretary's Discretionary Program provided about $1.1 million to support a variety of other projects related to student academic recognition, successful drug education practices and dissemination of educational television.

Table 1 displays the distribution of the Secretary's Discretionary Program funds for FY 1986.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF THE SECRETARY'S DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM FUNDS,
FY 1986

1. Statutorily Mandated Programs	(Total)	$14,639,000
Arts in Education		3,157,000
Inexpensive Book Distribution		6,698,000
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education		2,870,000
Law-Related Education		1,914,000
2. Congressional Directives	(Total)	$10,688,000
National Diffusion Network		10,238,000
Evaluation of Chapter 1		450,000
3. Secretary's Special Initiatives	(Total)	$2,470,000
Field-initiated Grants		1,372,000
Department Initiatives		1,098,000
Total Appropriation		$27,797,000

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

o Through the National Diffusion Network:

--To disseminate more information in the Secretary's priority areas, especially in mathematics, science, adult literacy, teacher preservice and in-service training, and technology applications;

--To increase the number, quality, and geographic spread of adoptions of exemplary efforts;

--To provide technical assistance; and

--To identify, through the Elementary School Recognition Program, a national group of exemplary elementary schools and to disseminate information about their programs, policies, and practices.

o Through the Secretary's Special Initiatives

--To conduct a field-initiated grant competition to permit funding of various activities of national significance to improve elementary and secondary education, and

--To support special projects designed to recognize student academic performance.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1986, the progress and accomplishments of each of the program's components were as follows:

National Diffusion Network:

The National Diffusion Network continued support of 64 Developer-Demonstrator grants and 53 State Facilitator grants and supported 16 new Developer-Demonstrator grants in priority areas that included mathematics, science, teacher training, adult literacy, reading, and writing; identified 25 new promising practices in different program areas; and helped prepare the submission packages for these 25 new practices for review by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel.

The Elementary School Recognition Program selected 270 public and private schools from among 631 nominated.

Secretary's Special Initiatives:

Fourteen field-initiated grants were awarded for projects of national significance to improve elementary and secondary education. These are designed to--

--Train teachers in school effectiveness techniques;

--Provide motivation and incentives for achievement among educationally deprived students;

--Train inner-city parents to participate effectively in their children's education;

--Expand the pool of qualified teaching candidates in areas of teacher shortages by innovative techniques;

--Expand in-service training opportunties through use of satellite teleconferences;

--Create a science education dissemination network;

--Create a collaborative university/secondary school teaching network; and

--Improve the skills of media coordinators in working with disadvantaged students.

Other projects were supported that recognize student academic performance; disseminate successful strategies for ridding schools of drugs; and caption, store, and disseminate educational television tapes.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope

Under the National Diffusion Network, costs are roughly $670 per school or about $5.55 per student served. On the basis of figures compiled from FY 1986 project applications, program staff reported that 14,907 schools were adopting and implementing exemplary projects. Approximately 59,000 educators received training to use programs and practices, and 1.8 million students were being served by programs adopted in these new sites.

Under the Secretary's Special Initiatives, 14 field-initiated awards were made for a total of $1.4 million. The awards went primarily to institutions of higher education and public or private agencies and organizations.

Program Effectiveness

National Diffusion Network:

No new information (see FY 1984 Annual Evaluation Report for latest information).

Secretary's Special Initiatives

No information is available.

D. Highlights of Activities

New NDN program regulations were published on August 14, 1986, which require educational programs to be reviewed by the Department's Joint Dissemination Review Panel for evidence of effectiveness every 4 years.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS [Response to GEPA 417(b)]

No studies about programs supported by the Secretary's Discretionary Program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations:

Secretary's Discretionary Program: James V. Capua, (202) 732-3600
National Diffusion Network : Shirley Curry, (202) 357-6134

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202)245-8638

Note

1. Section 583 of ECIA authorized up to 6 percent of the funds appropriated for Chapter 2 of the ECIA to be used for the Secretary's Discretionary Program.

SECRETARY'S DISCRETIONARY FUND FOR PROGRAMS OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE
(CFDA No. 84.168)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education for Economic Security Act (EESA) of 1984, Section 212, Title II, P.L. 98-377 (20 U.S.C. 3972) (expires October 1, 1988).

Funding Since 1985

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1985	$40,000,000 1/	$9,900,000 2/
1986	36,000,000 1/	3,875,000

Purpose: To improve the quality of teaching in mathematics and science, computer literacy, and instruction in critical foreign languages. (The list of critical languages was published in the Federal Register on August 2, 1985, [50 FR 31412]).

The Secretary's Discretionary Program provides assistance to State education agencies (SEAs) and local education agencies (LEAs), institutions of higher education, and nonprofit organizations for projects in mathematics and science instruction, computer learning, and instruction in critical foreign languages. The legislation mandates set-asides as follows:

- Critical Foreign Languages: Twenty-five percent must be reserved for projects at institutions of higher education to improve and expand instruction in critical foreign languages.
- Evaluation and Research: Up to $3 million may be reserved for evaluation and research activities to be conducted by the Department of Education.

The remaining monies are available for grant awards for projects of national significance in mathematics and science instruction, computer learning, and instruction in critical foreign languages and for other appropriate activities (e.g., educational television) that come under the broad mandate of improving the quality of teaching in the subjects of concern.

The planned allocation for the Secretary's Discretionary Program for mathematics, science, computer learning, and critical foreign languages in FY 1986 was as follows:

Critical foreign languages	$ 968,000 3/
Other Discretionary Activities	
Educational television	2,907,000
3-2-1 Contact!	1,000,000
Voyage of the Mimi	1,000,000
Children's Television Workshop Mathematics Series	907,000
Total	$3,875,000

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS [Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

During FY 1986, the Department's principal objectives for this program, by category, were as follows:

Critical Foreign Languages:

To make awards to institutions of higher education for the improvement and expansion of instruction in critical foreign languages. Projects to improve instruction include those designed--

- To provide short- or long-term advanced training to foreign-language instructors;
- To provide training in new teaching methods and proficiency evaluation techniques; and
- To improve teaching methods through curriculum development, including the use of technological equipment.

Projects to expand instruction include those designed--

- To add to the curriculum languages not currently offered,
- To add to the curriculum advanced language courses,
- To devise instructional approaches suited to diverse student populations, and
- To use technology to increase access to instruction in critical foreign languages.

Educational Television

To continue to make available high-quality educational television programs in mathematics, science, and technology.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1986, the progress and accomplishments of the program's components were as follows:

Critical Foreign Languages: A grant competition was conducted in the summer of 1986, and 18 awards were made.

Mathematics, Science, Comupter Learning, and Critical Foreign Languages

A grant competition was conducted and 26 awards were made in the summer of 1986.

Evaluation and Research Set-aside: A study of alternative teacher certification and retraining, especially of science and mathematics teachers, has been conducted. In addition, questions about gifted and talented science and mathematics programs were added to the National Education Longitudinal Study (NELS:88).

Other Discretionary Activities:

Educational Television: Funds were provided to support three educational television programs:

3-2-1 Contact!

Funds were provided to produce the third season of the Children's Television Workshop science and technology series for children 8 to 12 years old. Each series consists of 65 half-hour shows, broadcast each weekday for 13 weeks.

Voyage of the Mimi

Funds were provided to produce the second season of this science and mathematics series designed for grades four through six but applicable through grade eight. This TV series, produced by Bank Street College of Education and Holt, Rinehart and Winston Publishers, emphasizes a discovery approach to math and science by moving from real-world experiences to a more abstract understanding of science and math principles.

Mathematics Series

The Children's Television Workshop has received funding from the Department of Education, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, private foundations, and corporations to produce a new TV series for 8- to 10-year olds on math concepts and problem-solving strategies. The new series will be aired in about a year.

C. Costs and Benefits

No information is available.

D. Highlights of Activities

Legislation to authorize Title II of EESA for a 3-year period was signed into law on November 22, 1985.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

The legislation of Title II authorized the Secretary to conduct an evaluation of the programs assisted under Title II and to carry out a policy analysis of alternative methods to improve instruction in math and science. The Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation is currently developing plans to conduct these activities.

Contacts for Further Information

Programs Operations: James V. Capua, (202) 732-3600

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Notes

1. Title II of the EESA authorized $400 million for FY 1985, of which 90 percent was used for grants to States and 10 percent for the Secretary's Discretionary Fund for Programs of National Significance. In FY 1986, 1 percent was reserved for the U.S. Territories and for school programs administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and 9 percent set aside for the Secretary's Discretionary Fund for Programs of National Significance.

2. A total of $100 million was appropriated for this new program in FY 1985, of which $90.1 million is for grants to States (including amounts for the Territories and the BIA) and $9.9 million is for the Secretary's Discretionary Fund for Programs of National Significance.

3. This amount was combined with $637,104 of FY 1985 funds for a single competition in 1986.

EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.171)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Excellence in Education Act of 1984, Title VI of the Education for Economic Security Act, P.L. 98-377 (20 U.S.C. 4031 et seq.) (expires October 1, 1988). 1/

Funding Since 1985

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1985	$16,000,000	$5,000,000 2/
1986	16,000,000	2,392,000 3/

Purpose: To provide grant assistance to local education agencies (LEAs) for individual public schools that are implementing the recommendations of the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE), *A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, or otherwise striving to improve the quality of elementary or secondary education.

The legislation authorizes a grant program to LEAs to carry out projects of excellence in individual public schools through activities that (1) demonstrate successful techniques for improving the quality of education; (2) can be disseminated and replicated; and (3) are conducted with the participation of principals, teachers, parents, and business concerns in the community.

The legislation also authorizes a set-aside to conduct research, evaluation, and dissemination activities to assure that funded exemplary projects and practices are made available to LEAs across the country. Of this set-aside, a limited amount must be used to establish a panel to monitor the success of the projects supported by this program.

Two types of awards were made under this program: school excellence grants and special school grants. Both types of awards supported school improvement activities, but special school grants required the assurance of financial contributions from the private sector for the proposed activities. In order to be considered for an award, an application had to be submitted to the Department by a chief state school officer or chief educational officer from each State.

The funding priorities for the school excellence grants and special school grants were as follows:

1. Modernization and improvement of secondary school curriculums to improve student achievement in academic or vocational subjects and competency in basic functional skills;
2. Elimination of excessive electives and the establishment of increased graduation requirements in basic subjects;

3. Improvement in student attendance and discipline through the demonstration of innovative student motivation techniques and attendance policies with clear sanctions to reduce student absenteeism and tardiness;

4. Demonstrations to increase learning time for students;

5. Experimentation providing incentives to teachers and teams of teachers for outstanding performance;

6. Demonstrations to increase student motivation and achievement through creative combinations of independent study, team teaching, laboratory experience, technology utilization, and improved career guidance and counseling; or

7. Demonstrations of new and promising models of school-community and school-to-school relationships, including the use of nonschool personnel to alleviate shortages in areas such as mathematics, science, and foreign language instruction, as well as other partnerships between business and education, including the use of equipment.

The Secretary encouraged projects that increased parental involvement or increased students' knowledge of the early history of the American republic, the significance of its founding documents, and the origins and development of American government.

II. FY 1986 PROGRAM INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS
[Response to GEPA 417(a)]

A. Objectives

-- To make grant awards to LEAs to carry out projects of excellence in individual public schools; and

-- To conduct research, evaluation, and dissemination activities.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

School Excellence Awards:

One hundred and twenty-one awards were made to individual public schools for school improvement projects. Of this amount:

-- 31 of the projects were designed to improve curriculum at the secondary school level, including 14 proejcts on American history and citizenship;

-- 10 projects were to motivate students to improve attendance and discipline;

-- 7 projects were to increase learning time for students;

-- 18 projects provided teacher incentives for outstanding performance;

-- 34 projects were to increase student achievement through independent study, career guidance, or the use of technology; and

-- 21 projects were to demonstrate partnerships of schools, with their communities and business, with an emphasis on using nonschool personnel to help in areas where teachers are in short supply.

C. Costs and Benefits

Program Scope:

Out of 830 applications submitted, 121 grants were awarded to individual public elementary, middle, and senior high schools, in amounts ranging from $3,000 to $25,000 per award. Sixty awards were made under the Special School category and 61 under School Excellence category. The schools were located in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Marianas, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific.

Program Effectiveness:

No information is available on this program.

D. Highlights of Activities

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

None.

III. INFORMATION ON STUDY CONTRACTS
[Response to GEPA 417(b)]

None

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: James V. Capua, (202) 732-3600

Program Studies : Valena Plisko, (202) 245-8638

Notes

1. Legislation extending this authorization for 3 years was signed into law on November 22, 1985.

2. The Congress appropriated $5 million to implement this program for the 1985-86 school year. Of this amount, $1 million was available for school excellence grants, and $3 million was available for the special school grants. The remaining $1 million was reserved for research, evaluation, and dissemination activities.

3. In FY 1986, the Congress appropriated $2.4 million for this program. Of this amount, $1.8 million is available for special school grants. The remaining $600,000 is reserved for research, evaluation, dissemination, and monitoring activities.

APPENDIX

EVALUATION CONTRACTS ACTIVE IN OPBE DURING FISCAL YEAR 1986

Evaluation Contracts Active in OPBE Duri
Fiscal Year 1986

Printed: 03-Feb-87

STATE AND LOCAL GRANTS DIVISION

FY	Funding Amount	Description of Contract	Contractor & Contract No.	Start Date	End Date	OPBE Project Officer
85 86	$899,929 892,078	Operation of ECIA Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Center, Region 1, to provide consulting assistance in areas of evaluation and program improvement to SEA and LEA projects.	Educational Testing Service Princeton, N.J. 300-85-0195	01-Oct-85	30-Sep-87	Stonehill
85 86	$899,937 892,877	Operation of ECIA Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Center, Region 2, to provide consulting assistance in areas of evaluation and program improvement to SEA and LEA projects.	Advanced Technology, Inc. Indianapolis, Indiana 300-85-0196	01-Oct-85	30-Sep-87	English
85 86	$899,907 892,707	Operation of ECIA Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Center, Region 3, to provide consulting assistance in areas of evaluation and program improvement to SEA and LEA projects.	Educational Testing Service Princeton, New Jersey 300-85-0197	01-Oct-85	30-Sep-87	English
85 86	$900,000 918,135	Operation of ECIA Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Center, Region 4, to provide consulting assistance in areas of evaluation and program improvement to SEA and LEA projects.	Northwest Regional Laboratory Portland, Oregon 300-85-0198	01-Oct-85	30-Sep-87	Stonehill
83 84 86	$567,725 463,656 21,814	A study to develop a comprehensive base of information about nationwide operation of Chapter 2, ECIA, in local education agencies regarding program effects and administrative systems.	SRI International Menlo Park, California 300-83-0286	12-Dec-83	31-Jan-86	Chelemer
83 84 86	$1,514,000 2,619,352 1,029,731	A national longitudinal evaluation of the effectiveness of services for language-minority, limited-English-proficient students.	Development Associates, Inc. Arlington, Virginia 300-83-0030	01-Dec-82	30-Dec-86	Shuler
85	$438,591	Addition of limited-English-speaking Native American students to the national longitudinal evaluation.	Development Associates, Inc. Arlington, Virginia 300-85-0175	17-Sep-85	16-Dec-86	Shuler
84 85	$263,091 10,000	Assessment of Chapter 1, ECIA, grant program for the handicappped: who are served and in what settings in high- and low-use States.	Research and Evaluation Associates, Inc. Chapel Hill, North Carolina 300-84-0225	01-Oct-84	31-Mar-86	Maxwell

85 86	.4,551 476,859	Development, field test, and refinement of procudures and materials for evaluating the impact on achievement of LEA projects funded under Title VII, ESEA (Bilingual Education).	Technologies, Inc. Mountain View, California 300-85-0140	08-Jul-85	08-Jan-86	glish
85 86	$160,000 170,000	A study to document the processes and procedures that nine States will develop to implement the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act.	E. H. White Washington, D. C. 300-85-0166	23-Aug-85	22-Aug-87	Muraskin
84 85	$534,000 81,000	A study of recent trends in the Vocational Rehabilitation Program's caseloads and placement patterns.	Ecosometrics, Inc. Bethesda, Maryland 300-84-0250	01-Sep-84	30-Jan-87	Kirschenbaum
85	$438,795	Analysis of rehabilitation services in the proprietary sector: a study to identify and analyze factors contributing to the rapid growth of private sector rehabilitation services.	Berkeley Planning Associates Berkeley, California 300-85-0141	01-Jul-85	30-Jun-87	Kirschenbaum
85 86	$223,528 519,922	Data analysis support contract to carry out data gathering and analytic work to provide background information for work of OPBE staff.	Policy Studies Associates Washington, D. C. 300-85-0103	23-Sep-85	22-Sep-87	Stonehill
86	$97,005	Perform logistical and support services for the second round of the Secretary's Chapter 1 Recognition Program.	Center for Systems and Program Development Washington, D. C. 300-86-0008	23-Dec-85	31-May-86	Chelemer

STUDENT AND INSTITUTIONAL AID DIVISION

84 85 86	$138,650 209,715 80,981	Purchase of proprietary data on freshman college students for Higher Education Research Survey on fall enrollments. Financial aid, attitudinal, economic and demographic information obtained from sample of 250-300,000 students.	HERI, UCLA Los Angeles, California 300-84-0163	29-Jun-84	01-Jul-87	Bart
84 85	$130,000 140,000	The Higher Education Surveys each year provide the Department with two policy-relevant, quick response surveys from a sample of institutions of higher education. (Supported by ED, NSF, and NEH.)	Westat Research Corp. Rockville, Maryland (Funds transfer to NSF)	01-Oct-85	30-Sep-90	Berls

85 86	[illegible]0,000 [illegible]5,000	Technical support for planning and analysis of postsecondary programs, to provide the Department with secondary data collection and quick response analytical capability for policy and budgetary analysis and program planning.	[illegible]ied Systems Institute, Inc. [illegible]hington, D. C. 300-83-0160	01-Apr-83	31-Oct-86	[illegible]rissey

QUALITY AND EQUALITY OF EDUCATION DIVISION

85 86	$474,043 548,418	The Education Analysis Center analyzes and synthesizes findings of pertinent past and current research and evaluation studies; analyzes existing relevant and complex data bases; develops models; conducts case studies; and performs literature searches and reviews.	Pelavin Associates, Inc. Washington, D. C. 300-85-0184	01-Oct-85	30-Sep-87	Takai

PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS DIVISION

86	$588,695	Data analysis and technical support, to provide on-call processing and education analysis capability. The major tasks involve compiling data bases and performing data analysis or simulations, organizing and displaying information for use by the Department, and producing technical papers and reports.	Decision Resources Corporation Washington, D. C. 300-86-0094	30-May-86	28-Feb-87	Ginsburg
83 84 85 86	$600,000 500,000 725,000 475,953	Description and longitudinal survey of immersion programs for bilingual students.	SRA Technologies Mountain View, California 300-83-250	01-Oct-83	30-Sep-88	Baker
84 85	$384,412 25,064	Evaluation of Indian-controlled schools. A mandated study, which examined student costs, achievement, attendance and attrition in schools serving the 8th or 12th grades.	Abt Associates, Inc. Cambridge, Massachusetts 300-84-0264	30-Sep-84	31-Dec-85	Barnes
84 85 86	$136,394 225,000 27,406	Examination of the state of the art of methods used to identify students for eligibility for bilingual education programs.	Pelavin Associates Washington, D. C. 300-84-0268	30-Sep-84	30-Jun-87	Baker
85 86	$500,000 194,822	A survey of the attitudes and educational preferences of parents of several groups of language minority children.	Educational Testing Service Princeton, New Jersey 300-85-0208	30-Sep-85	30-Dec-86	Baker

INDEX TO THE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

INDEX TO THE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

Note: All three-digit numbers are chapter references. These numbers appear in the upper-right hand corner of each page of the report.

Academic Facilities, 523, 524
Adult Education:
  Indian Education, 113
  State Administered Program, 407
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education, 114
American Indians, see Indian Education
Arts in Education Program, 117

Basic Educational Opportunity (Pell) Grants, 501
Bilingual Education:
  Academic Excellence, 201
  Developmental, 201
  Evaluation Assistance Centers, 202
  Family English Literacy, 201
  Fellowships, 203
  Immigrant Education, 205
  National Clearinghouse, 202
  Multifunctional Resource Centers, 203
  Program for the Development of Instructional Materials, 201
  Research and Development Program, 202
  Special Alternative Instruction, 201
  Special Populations Program, 201
  State Education Agency Programs, 204
  Support Services, 204
  Training Projects, 203
  Transition Program for Refugee Children, 204
  Vocational Training, 406
  Vocational Instructor Training, 406
  Vocational Instructional Materials, 406
Block Grant (Elementary and Secondary Education), 104
Business and International Education (Language Training, Area Studies), 520

Captioned Film Loan Program (Media Services), 312
Centers for Independent Living, 333
Civil Rights Training and Advisory Services, 106
Close Up Foundation (Ellender Fellowships), 110
College Housing Loans, 522-524
College Work-Study, 506
College Cooperative Education, 521
Consolidation of Programs for Elementary and Secondary Education, 104
Construction, Schools (in federally affected areas), 109
Consumer and Homemaker Education, 402
Cooperative Education, 521

Deaf-Blind, Programs for, 305, 331
Delinquent Children, 103
Desegregation Assistance, 106, 115
  On the Basis of Sex, 106, 115
  On the Basis of National Origin, 106
  On the Basis of Race, 106
Direct Loan Program, 505
Disadvantaged Students:
  Children in State-Administered Institutions, 103
  Education for, 101, 107, 110
  Higher Education, 501, 502, 505, 507-510, 514, 515, 517, 518, 605
  Legal Training for, 517
  Special Services for, 510
  Vocational Education Programs for, 402, 404
Disaster Aid, 108
Dissemination of Exemplary Educational Practices, 611
Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad, (Fulbright-Hays), 519
Drug Abuse, 114

Early Education for Handicapped Children, 306
Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, 101-104, 114, 117-119
Education for the Disadvantaged, 101-103, 107, 110, 201, 202, 204, 205, 402, 404, 501, 502, 505, 507-510, 514, 517, 518, 605
Educational Opportunity Centers, 509
Educational Television and Technology, 611
Elementary and Secondary Education Block Grant, 104
Ellender Fellowships, 110
Entitlement Grants to Local Education Agencies and Indian-Controlled Schools, 111
Excellence in Education, 613

Faculty Research Abroad (Fulbright-Hays), 519
Fellowships:
  Bilingual Teachers, 203
  Foreign Language and Area Studies, 520
  Graduate and Professional Study, 112, 518-520
  Indian Students, 112
Film, Captioned (Media Services), 312
Follow Through, 107
Foreign Language and Area Studies, 519, 520
Fulbright-Hays Grants, 519
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), 512

General Assistance to the Virgin Islands, 105
Graduate and Professional Study, Fellowships for, 112, 518-520
Guaranteed Student Loans, 504

Handicapped Children, Early or Preschool Education for, 302, 303, 306
Handicapped:
  Arts in Education, 117
  Client Assistance Program, 326
  Deaf-Blind, Programs for, 305, 331
  Higher Education for, 308, 510
  Independent Living, 333
  Indians, 334
  Media and Films for, 312
  Migrants, 330
  National Institute of Handicapped Research, 324
  Personnel Training and Recruitment for Education of, 309, 310, 327
  Postsecondary, 308
  Preschool, 302, 303, 306
  Recreation, 329
  Regional Resource Centers, 304
  Research, Demonstration, 306-308, 311, 313, 314, 324, 328, 331
  Secondary, 314
  Services to, 117, 301-315, 324-335, 401
  Severely Handicapped, 307, 328
  Special Studies, 313
  State Aid Grants, 302
  State-Supported Schol Programs, State Grant Program, 301
  Transitional Services, 314
  Vocational Rehabilitation for, 314, 325, 328, 330, 332, 334, 401
Hawaiian Natives, Vocational Education for, 405
Helen Keller National Center, 331
High School Equivalency Program, Migrant Education, 116
Higher Education:
  Cooperative Education, 521
  Developing Institutions, 512, 514, 515
  Direct Grants, 501, 502
  Direct Loans, 505
  for the Deaf, 308
  for the Disadvantaged, 502, 502, 505, 507-510, 514, 515, 517, 518, 605
  for the Handicapped, 308, 510
  for Indian Students, 112
  for Migrant Students, 116
  for Veterans, 511
  for Women, 518, 605
  Guaranteed Student Loans, 504
  Housing, Loans, 522, 523, 524
  Improvement, 512
  Institutional Aid, 507-512, 514, 515, 522-524, 604-607
  Law, 516, 517
  Postgraduate, 518-520
  Special Staff Training, 513
  State Student Incentive Grants, 503
  Supplemental Grants, 502
  Talent Search, 508
  Work-Study, 506

Immigrant Education Program, Emergency, 205
Impact Aid, see School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas
Incentive Grants to States for Student Assistance, 503
Independent Living, Centers for, 333
Indian Education:
  Adult Indian Education, 113
  Demonstration Projects, 112
  Educational Service Projects, 112
  Entitlement Grants to Local Education Agencies and Indian-Controlled Schools, 111
  Fellowships for Indian Students, 112
  Personnel Development Projects, 112
  Resource, Evaluation Centers, 112
  Vocational Education for Indian Tribes and Organizations, 405
  Vocational Rehabilitation, 334
Indian Students, Services or Aid to, 101, 111-113, 334, 518
Inexpensive Book Distribution, 118
Institutions of Higher Education, Payments to, 507-512, 514, 515, 522-524, 604-607
Interest Subsidy Grants for Academic Facilities Loans, 523
Interlibrary Cooperation, State Grants, 603
International Education and Business Program (Language Training and Area Studies), 520

Language and Areas Studies, 519, 520
Language-Minority or Limited-English-Proficient, Services or Aid to, 101, 102, 116, 201-205, 406, 602
Law-Related Education, 119, 516, 517
Law School Clinical Experience, 516
Legal Training for the Disadvantaged, 517
Libraries:
  Career Training, 605
  Construction Grants, 608
  for Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives, 609
  Grants to State Library Agencies, 602-604, 608
  Literacy Program, 604
  Public Library Services, State Grants, 602, 603
  Research and Demonstration, 606
  Strengthening Research Library Resources, 607
Magnet Schools Assistance, 121
Mathematics and Science State Grants, 120
Media Services and Captioned Film Loan Program, 312
Migrant Education:
  College Assistance Program, 116
  Handicapped, 330
  High School Equivalency Program, 116
  State Formula Grants, 102
Mina Shaughnessy Scholars Program, (FIPSE), 512
Minority Institutions, 515
Minority Students, Services or Aid to, 101, 102, 107, 110, 201, 205, 404, 406, 501-503, 505, 507-510, 515, 517, 518, 602, 605

National Diffusion Network, 611
National Graduate Fellowships, 525
National Institute of Handicapped Research, 324

Pell Grants (formerly BEOGs), 501
Perkins, Carl D., Scholarships, 526
Personnel Training, Recruitment for Education of the Handicapped, 309, 310, 327
Postsecondary Education (See Higher Education)
Preschool Education for Handicapped Children, 302, 303, 306
Professional Study, Fellowships for, 518-520
Public Library Services, State Grants, 602, 603

Reading Is Fundamental (Inexpensive Book Distribution), 118
Recruitment and Information (Special Education), 310
Refugee Children, 204
Rehabilitation, See Vocational Rehabilitation
Research and Development:
  Handicapped, 306-308, 311, 313, 324, 328, 331
  Libraries, 606, 607
  Office, 610
  Secretary's Special Initiatives, 611
  Vocational Education, 404

Secretary's Discretionary Program, 114, 117-119, 611, 612
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas-School Construction, 109
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas-Maintenance and Operations, 108
Science Improvement, 515
Shaughnessy, Mina, Scholars Program (FIPSE), 512
Special Education, Recruitment and Information, 309, 310
Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, 510
State Student Incentive Grants, 503
Strengthening Research Library Resources, 607
Student Assistance, Postsecondary (See Higher Education)
Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, 502

Talent Search, 508
Teacher Training:
  Bilingual Education, 203, 204
  Special Education, 309
  Teachers of Secondary Disadvantaged Students, 110
  Territorial Teachers, 601
  Vocational (Bilingual), 406
Technology and Educational Television, 611
Territorial Teacher Training, 601
Training and Recruitment, Handicapped Education, 309, 310
Training, Librarians, 605
Training, Bilingual Education Projects, 204
Training, Rehabilitation Personnel, 327
Training, Special Program Staff, 513

Upward Bound, 507

Veterans' Cost-of-Instruction, 511
Virgin Islands, General Assistance to, 105
Vocational Education:
  Basic Grants to States, 401
  Bilingual, See Bilingual Vocational Programs
  Community-Based, 403
  Consumer and Homemaking Education, 402
  Programs for the Disadvantaged, 401, 402, 404
  Programs for Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives, 405
  Research and Occupational Information, 404
Vocational Rehabilitation:
  Centers for Independent Living, 333
  Migratory Farmworkers, 330
  Projects With Industry, 332
  Rehabilitation Services, Basic Support, 325
  Secondary Education and Transition Services, 314
  Severely Handicapped, 328

Women's Educational Equity, 106, 115
Work-Study, College, 506